THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now, we will take up the discussion on the General Budget. (*Interruptions*). Just a minute. Mr. Afzal, we are not taking up Special Mentions. (*Interruptions*). Just a minute. Today we are having the Budget discussion. We are not taking up any other thing. Now, we have to start the discussion on the General Budget. I am sorry. But you cannot behave like this. You cannot send papers during the Question Hour. I cannot allow you... (*Interruptions*)...

SHRI MOHAMMED AFZAL *alias* MEEM AFZAL: I only requested you. What is my behaviour like?... (*Interruptions*)...

THE BUDGET (GENERAL) 1994-95—Contd.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Somebody has to speak on the Budget. I shall now call Shri Shiv Prasad Mishra, not here, Shri Govind Rao Adik. Not here, Dr. Shrikant Jichkar. Not here. Those who are absent today, I am not going to call them again. Time will also be reduced from their party's time. We cannot keep on having discussions on the Budget when the House has to adjourn tomorrow. Whoever is not here, I am not calling them. Mr. Jadhav, you may speak now.

SHRI VITHALRAO MADHAVRAO JADHAV (Maharashtra): Madam, Deputy Chairman, thank you very much for giving me this opportunity to speak on the General Budget. I am also grateful to the Members who have remained absent today because of which I am getting a chance to speak. Madam, Deputy Chairman, when we look at the Budget presented by the Finance Minister—this is the third Budget that he has presented—we see that that country is passing through a very difficult stage. It is passing through economic crisis. But we are making a quantum jump towards having an independent economy. When we look at the economic survey made in 1991-92, we find that we had a foreign exchange reserve of about one billion dollars. In 1992-93, it went up to 6.4 billion dollars. The inflation rate was 17 per cent when we took over the charge from the Janata Dal Government. Now, it has come down to 7 per cent. A tremendous change in the economy has also been made. We have registered some economic growth. There are certain fields which have remained stagnant. But the overall picture is that of economic growth. The economic growth in 1991-92 was 1.1 per cent. Today it is 4 per cent. In 1990-91, the Gross National Product was Rs. 468,000 crores. In 1991-92, it has gone up to Rs. 540,000 crores. In 1992-93, it has again gone up to Rs. 660,000 crores. This is the achievement we have made in regard to the Gross National Product. During 1980-81, we had inflation and the value of rupee had come down. But inspite of that, the Gross National Product was 4.7 per cent more than that of the previous year. In 1991, it did not respond very well. But still, it registered a growth of 0.6 per cent. In 1992, it registered a growth of 4.3 per cent and 8 months later, that is, in 1993-94, it has registered a growth of 3.8 per cent. The Gross Domestic Product also improved tremendously. It was 4.9 per cent, then 1.1 per per cent, 4.0 per cent and then 3.0 per cent. Regarding agricultue, some Members from the other side said that agricultural production had fallen down. I do agree with some of the points raised by them. We must understand that agriculture depends upon good monsoons and favourable climatic conditions. It also largely depends on infrastructure facilities like irrigation, fertilizers, seeds and also modern technology. When we took over charge, the total agricultural production was 192.2 million tonnes. Eeven though it came down to 188.5 million tonnes in 1991-92, it went up to 195.8 million tonnes in 1992-93. As regards foodgrains production, in 1990-91, it was 176.4 million tonnes; in 1991-92, it was 168.4 million tonnes and in 1992-93, it went up to 180 million tonnes. The foodgrains production of 179.1 million tonnes recorded in 1991 was due to good monsoon. Madam, there has been a continuoes increase in the growth of agricultural production.

Madam, as regards industiral production, the hon. Finance Minister has given a lot of potential to the growth of the industrial Survey, I do not find much pro-

[Shri Vithalrao Madhavrao Jadhav]

Economic Survey, I do not find much progress in this sector. Ever since we took over, there has been an increase in the industrial production even though only marginal increase. In spite of giving so many facilities to the industrial sector, the industrial growth rate has only been marginal. As my esteemed industrialist friend, Mr. Birla, said, I am also equally afraid that we are opening our gates to the multinationals It should not so happen that the multinationals would, in course of time, dominate our industrial sector and our industrialists should suffer a setback. It should be our primary to see to it that our industries are given good potential so that they are able to prosper. That is what I feel

Madam, the other thing is as as regards the Consumer price Index. Index. My friends on the other side have been criticising the Government on this score. The Consume" Price Index in 1990-91 recorded 201 229 points in 1992-93, it was 243 points and in 1993-94. that is in was 243 points and in 1993-94, that is in the first seven months, it touched 264 points. So, the Consumer Price Index did show an increasing figure. The growth rate in 1990 91 was 13.6 per cent, in 1991-92, it was 13.9 per cent, in 1992-93, it was 6.1 per cent and in the fist seven month of 1993-94, it has gone up to 8.6 per cent.

Madam, as regards imports and exports, our central theme has been that imports should be reduced and exports should be increased. When we see the figures of imports, in 1990-91; the imports were to the tune of Rs. 43,119 crores; then there was an increase in the imports in 1991-92, that is, they went up to Rs 47,851 crores; again in the year 1992-93, they went up to Rs. 63.375 crores; in 1993-94, the imports were only Rs. 51477 crores. When we compare the imports of 1990-91 with that of 1991-92 and 1992-93, there has been an increase but the imports of 1993 decreased by 8.4 per cent. As regards exports, there has been a quantum jump in exports. In 1990-91, the exports were to the tune of Rs. 32.553 crores in 1991-92 there was an increase of about Rs. 12.000 crores that is, the imports were Rs. 44,041 crores; in 1992-93, they were to the tune of Rs. 53,688 crores and in 1993-94, in the first seven months, the exports were to the tune of Rs. 49,182 crores. The foreign exchange reserves also increased during these years, So, it was because of the increase in exports that the balance of payment position could improve. For this, I congratulate our hon. Finance Minister on giving a new momentum to the economy of this country. Madam, now. I want to come to agriculture which is my main subject, and I would like to say what the hon. Minister has done for agriculture. Madam, this Economic Survey which has been presented to the Parliament says that the Government has tried to give some initiative to agriculture. I am very sorry to state that the provision for agricultureal credit is only Rs. 13,000 crores this year whereas it was Rs. 19,000 crores in 1991-92. And in the 1992-93 Budget, the hon. Minister has stated, "Now we are making a quantum jump in agricultural credit from Rs. 13.000 crores to Rs. 16,000 crores." Besically, it was Rs. 19,000 crores. It came down to Rs. 18.000 crores. Now, it has come down to Rs, 13,000 crores this year. So, day by day, agricultural credit is getting decreased.

Now, I want to bring to the notice of the hon. House some factors which are important for agriculture. What is important for agriculture is irrigation. Water is the main source of life either for the human life or the plant life or the animal life. When we look towards irrigation, what have we done in regard to irrigation? Madam, at the end of the seventh Five Year Plan, our maior and medium irrigation potential was 29.9 million hectares, and the utilisation was 25.5 million hectares. It shows that utilisation was less by four million hectares. We have got water available. We have not dams with us. But we could not utilise the water that is available. So, as soon as a dam is constructed, as soon as an irrigation facility is created, we should see that full utilisation of the irrigation

resource takes place. This is about major irrigation projects. About minor irrigation, the potention created was 46.6 million hectares, and the utilisation was 43.1 million hectares. The total potential created at the end of the Seventh Five-Year Plan was 36.6 million hectares and the utilisation was 76.5 million hectares. Madam, at the end of 1991-92, the total potential created was 81 million hectares, and the utilisation was 72.9 million hectares. This shows that we could not utilise the irrigation potential which is sufficient for 8 million hectares. If we had utilised the irrigation potential created for 81 million hectares, we would have got an additional foodgrains' production of more than 14 to 15 million tonnes, and the country would have been benefited to this extent. Therefore, I request the hon. Finance Minister, the Ministries of Planning, Agriculture and Irrigation that while planning to tackle the irrigation potential they should see that as soon as any irrigation source is created, full utilisation of that irrigation source should be made. Why I am saying this is because I know there are some projects which have been completed in Maharashtra But there are no connecting channels or other facilities created The dam is full of water but the water is being wasted Some times it evaporates. Sometimes, because of fear of flood and other things, the gates are opened and the water is let into the rivers. Therefore, this should not happen. There should be a comprehensive planning.

Madam, I now come to another important point. If irrigation potential is increased, more production of foodgrains can take place. In the same way, if most of the area is brought under high-yielding varieties, more production of foodgrains will take place. Last year, 22.2 million hectares were brought under high-yielding variety. This year, the area is 22.8 million hectares Day by day, our area under this high-yielding varieties is increasing, and that is very essential also. Unless we introduce high-yielding varieties for cultivation, we cannot get a better yield.

Now, the GATT agreement has come and our Government has accepted this agreement, though I objected to some of the clauses on patents rights during our discussion on GATT proposals. I am afraid our natural flora and fauna may become the monopoly of somebody else. This should not happen. It should not go into the hands of another East India Company or some American company and we must protect our independence.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now they are West India companies.

SHRI VITHALRAO MADHAVRAO JADHAV: West India or East India; now Japan will also come in if we open our door to them. From that point of view, I request that our agriculture should be on scientific lines. At the same time, I condemn the policy of the Government because out of our total expenditure of Rs. 1,25,000 crores per year, we are spending only Rs. 15 to 16 thousand crores on agriculture on which 70 per cent of our population depends. Many a time I have demanded in the House that at least 50 to 60 per cent of our total spending should be on agriculture, on irrigation, on rural power, on rural employment etc. Dr. Manmohan Singh, in his Budget, has intoduced many reforms in the economic structure but there is no increase in employment generation. What we need today is more employment for the rural population. About 60 crores of people depend on agriculture, whereas our agriculture has the capacity to bear a population of only 10 crores. There is pressure of population on agriculture; there is lack of irrigation facilities; there is lack of technology in agriculture; there is lack of seed material Our total potential of irrigation is 115 million hectares but till today we have created irrigation for just 75 to 80 million hectares. Whether we have more water or less water is immaterial. We have to evolve some method whereby we are able to have our crops with lesser quanity of water. But as things stand today, we have to provide water for our crops. India is country which can be called a Divine State. We have tremendous amount of natural resources for agriculture,

are a treasure in agriculture even though we have only one-third of the land mass compared to the USA, under agriculture. But we have a tremendous potential. For example, in Maharashtra, very few people grow grapes. Last year they exported grapes worth Rs. 29 crores and this year they have a target of export of grapes worth Rs. 120 crores and then there are so many agricultural crops...(*Time bell rings.*) Madam, this is very important.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I know it is very important but I have other Members also listed here to speak.

SHRI VITHALRAO MADHAVRAO JADHAV: So many people are absent today.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That doesn't mean that you should get their time.

SHRI VITHALRAO MADHAVRAO JADHAV: I will obey you and conclude. What I was saying is that if you don't take care of agriculture, this country has no future. We must take care of it because our country's economy is agro-based and not based on industry alone, agriculture should be given prime importance in our planning.

I would request, through you, Madam, our Minister of Planning and our hon. Prime Minister, who, himself, is an agriculturist and who comes from my neighbouring district, in Andhra Pradesh. They should ensure the welfare of the farmers in the country because only then the country would grow, the country would become prosperous and it would be the largest country.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Strongest.

SHRI VITHALRAO MADHAVRAO JADHAV: Madam, as you know, a large number of people are dependent on agriculture. They could not develop economically. I remember a *sher*

एक हूक सी दिल में उठती है, एक दर्द जिगर में उठता है, मैं रात में उठकर रोता हूं जब सारा आलम सोता है" तो किसानों की यह हालत है, एग्रीकल्चरिस्ट्स की यह हालत है।

Therefore, we must take care of our agriculturists. While planning we should see that more allocation is made to agriculture, agro-based industries, irrigation and rural development programmes.

Now, Madam, I want to raise some important issues concerning Maharashtra. I will take just two-trree minutes.

I come from the Marathwada region. I have been talking about this from the very beginning. There is only 50 kms. of National Highways in the Marathwada region out of the 5,000 kms. of National Highways in the entire Maharashtra State. We have given proposals. The Government of Maharashtra has also submitted proposals that some of the State Highways should be converted into National Highways. At least, there are two such State Highways; one is the Nasik-Aurangabad-Nanded Hyderabad highway and the other is the Ratnagiri-Kolhapur-Solapur-Nanded-Nagpur highway. These two State Highways should be taken up on priority and converted into National waatrao Chavan. They were social retent, solve the problems of the Marathwada region.

While on the problems of the Marathwada region, I would like to congratulate our hon. Prime Minister, the entire Central Cabinet and the hon. Chief of Maharashtra for setting up the Statutory Development Boards for Marathwada, Vidarbha and the rest of Maharashtra. There was a widespread demand from the people of these regions. This demand having been met, we hope that the gates would be opened for the economic development of these backward regions and they would make good progress in the fields of agriculture, industry, etc.

I come to my last point. Madam, for the last fifteen years, there has been a popular demand in Marath-

wada in regard to the renaming of the Marathwada Vidyapeeth Madam, we had Dr. Ambedkar, Mahatma Pule, Rajarishi Shau Maharaj and Shri Yashwantrao Chavan. They were social reformers. They were not just politicians, They changed the social set-up of Maharashtra. There has been a popular demand that the Marathwada Vidyapeeth should be renamed as Dr. Ambedkar Marathwada Vidyapeeth. Our hon. Chief Minister had the courage to change the name of this Vidyapeeth. Actually, it was a question of extending the name; not changing it. It was changed from Marathwada Vidyapeeth to Dr. Ambedkar Marathwada Vidyapeeth. For this, I congratulate our Chief Minister, our hon. Prime Minister and the Congress Party. I congraturate them for fulfiling the aspiration of the people of the Marathwada region. With these observations, I conclude. Thank you.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much. A very good speech for the farmers.

Before I call upon Mr. Digvijay Singh to speak, I have to inform Members about one thing. If the House so agrees, we can dispense with the lunch hour. Mrs. Margaret Alva is going to provide a good dinner to us.

SHRI MENTAY PADMANABHAM (Andhra Pradesh): During lunch hour?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: In the evening (*Interrupions*) If we dispense with the lunch hour, in lieu of it, she will give us dinner. We hope that it would be a good dinner she is going to give us.

THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION (SHRI SIKANDER BAKHT): Madam, we should know as to how long we are to remain here. You should specify some time.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We have to finish the Business by sitting through the whole night, if necessary: perhaps, we may have even breakfast tomorrow. Another thing is, I expect the Finance Minister to give his reply at 3.30 p.m.

SHRI JAGESH DESAI (Maharashtra): At 6 p.m.?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: At 3.30 p.m.

SHRI MENTAY PADMANABHAM: Today?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Today. (*Interruptions*). We have to finish other Business also.

SHRI SIKANDER BAKHT: We have three Ordinances.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We have to finish all the Business today because tomorrow is Private Members' day. Then, we have to bid farewell to the retiring Members and we have a function for the retiring Members in the evening. We do not have enough time. Therefore, we have to finish all the Business today and you all please be helpful to each other. Now, Mr. Digvijay Singh, please.

श्री दिग्विजय सिंह : अगर आपके 36 मिनट लिखे हैं, कोई जरूरी नहीं है कि आप 36 मिनट ही बोलें, आपकी काबलियत इसमें है कि आप 25 मिनट में वह बात कह दें।

श्री दिग्विजय सिंह (बिहार) : उपसभापति महोदया, इस सदन को वित्त मंत्री को सुनते हुए यह चौथी बार मौका मिला और मेरे जैसे सदस्य को भी यह मौका मिला है। वित्त मंत्री जी ने चौथी बार अपना बजट, इस देश का बजट, इस सदन के सामने रखा है। जब पहली बार बजट पेश किया गया था 1991 में तो वित्त मंत्री ने और उनकी सरकार के वजीरे आज़म नरसिंह राव जी ने देश को कहा था कि तीन साल तक आप इंतजार करो। तीन साल में हम इस देश की सारी इकोनोमी ठीक कर देंगे। यही नहीं इस सदन में ही नहीं, इस देश के लाल किले से प्रधान मंत्री ने 15 अगस्त का इस्तेमाल करते हुए कहा था कि तीन साल का मोरेटोरियम रखा जाए इस देश में तीन साल कोई

[श्री दिग्विजय सिंह]

आंदोलन नहीं चलाया जाए, इस देश में तीन साल तक तसल्ली रखी जाए और हम इस देश की पूरी अर्थ व्यवस्था को ठीक कर देंगे। यह भरोसा देश को दिलाया गया था। उपसभापति महोदया, मैं उस बात में नहीं जाना चाहता, हम तब भी इसका विरोध कर रहे थे। हम तब भी कह रहे थे कि तीन साल का समय कोई मामूली समय नहीं है कि जिसका हम इंतजार करें। हम भी कह रहे थे कि जिन बातों को लेकर आप चल रहे हैं उससे इस देश की तरक्की नहीं हो सकती है। लेकिन तब हमारा विरोध इसलिए विरोध माना गया था कि उस विरोध के पीछे तर्क यह था कि हम उसके पहले की सरकार में थे और सारा दोष दिया गया कि उसी सरकार की बुराइयों की वजह से उसी सरकार की गलत नीतियों की वजह से हमारी अर्थ व्यवस्था टूट गई, चरमरा गई, वरना हम दुनिया के सब से काबिल देश होते। ...(व्यवधान)

श्री जगेश देसाई: आपकी सरकार के बारे में नहीं कहा था वह अगली सरकार के बारे में कहा था।

श्री सत्य प्रकाश मालवीय (उत्तर प्रदेश): उस सरकार को तो आप लोग सपोर्ट ही कर रहे थे।

श्री दिग्विजय सिंह: इसलिए उपसभापति महोदया, मैं कहना चाहूंगा कि अगर उस बहस को फिर से मैं सोच रहा था कि इस बजट में बार-दार नहीं कहा जाएगा लेकिन जो बजट आ गया, बजट के बाद से सरकार की तरफ से बोला गया सदस्यों ने बोला ट्रेजरी बेंचेज की तरफ से उन सारे लोगों ने इस बात को बार-बार जोर दिया और तुलनात्मक अध्ययन 1991 का 1994-95 से किया गया। उपसभापति महोदया, मैं उन बातों में नहीं जाना चाहता कि 1991 की हालत क्या थी यह किसी से छुपी हुई बात नहीं है और मैं यह मान भी लूं कि 1991 में सारा कुछ गलत था, मैं यह भी मान लूं कि जो अर्थ नीति चलाई गई उस सरकार के द्वारा या वह जो सारे माहौल में परिस्थितियां बनीं उनसे हमारी अर्थ व्यवस्था टूट गई। तो मैं जानना चाहूंगा कि 1994-95 में क्या हुआ? उपसभापति महोदया, मैं जब यह बात कह रहा हूं तो बड़ी गंभीरता से कह रहा हूं और इसलिए कह रहा हूं कि हमारा विरोध सरकार की अर्थ नीतियों से ज्यादा उन सवालों से था जिनको सरकार चकनाचूर कर रही थी। मैं हमेशा बार-बार इस बात को दोहरा रहा था कि इस देश की आर्थिक नीति बनाते हुए जिन लोगों ने आर्थिक नीतियां बनाई थीं, वे कोई मामूली लोग नहीं थे, वे कोई एक दिन की बनी हुई चीज नहीं थी, वह आजादी की लड़ाई का एक धरोहर थी, आजादी की लड़ाई का एक हिस्सा था। गांधी जी ने 1921 से इस देश में प्रमुख आंदोलनकर्ता के रूप में इस देश को झकझोरने का काम किया था उस समय झकझोरा था जो आजादी के बाद हमने अपनी आर्थिक नीति बनाई थी। पं. जवाहर लाल जी ने जो आर्थिक नीति बनाई थी वह एक दिन की आर्थिक नीति नहीं थी, वह आर्थिक नीति भी 20-22 साल का जो आंदोलन था 1921 से लेकर 1945 तक का आंदोलन उस आंखों ने भी जो हजारों-लाखों लोगों को झकझोरा था, जिसने देश के लिए कुर्बानी देने के लिए तैयार किया था, जिस आंदोलन ने उस आंदोलन की बनाई हुई वह आर्थिक नीति थी और जवाहर लाल नेहरू जी को 1947 से ले कर 1955 तक का लगातार

आजाद हिन्दुस्तान में आर्थिक नीति बनाने के लिए 7–8 साल का समय लगा था। विद्वान आदमी थे, विद्वानों की फौज उनके साथ थी, जो लोग काम करते थे वे विद्वान थे और उन विद्वानों की टीम को भी 7–8 वर्ष लगा था उस आर्थिक नीति को तैयार करने में, तब जाकर वह आर्थिक नीति तैयार हो सकी थी। इसलिए हमारा विरोध था कि अचानक कोई ऐसा काम मत करो आप अचानक इस देश को उस मंसूबे से बदलने का काम मत करो, जिस देश के लोगों को कुरबानियों के लिए इस देश के राष्ट्र निर्माताओं ने इस देश के स्वाधीनता आंदोलन के नेताओं ने प्रेरित किया था यही हमारा विरोध उस समय था और हमारा कोई विरोध नहीं था। हम चाहते थे कि 1991 में जो बात हम कह रहे थे जो आपको चेतावनी दे रहे थे, वह चेतावनी गलत हो जाती । हम यह भी चाहते थे कि हम जो बात कह रहे हैं वह गलत हो जाती इसलिए कि हम से बड़ा देश था। अगर हम गलत थे, अगर आपका रास्ता सही था तो देश प्रगति करता, देश तरक्की के रास्ते पर जाता, इसलिए हम चाहते थे कि हमारी बात गलत साबित हो। लेकिन उप सभापति महोदया, मैं बड़े अफसोस के साथ आज कह रहा हूं कि जिन बातों को 1991 से मैं कह रहा था आज 1994 में भी वे बातें सही निकल रही हैं और सही ही नहीं निकल रही है बल्कि जिन चेतावनियों को मैं बार-बार दोहरा रहा था वे चेतावनियां आज सही निकल रही हैं । गांधी का देश, गांधी का सपना आज चकनाचूर होते हुए नजर आ रहा है, लेकिन मुझे एक बात की खुशी है, एक ही बात इस अंधेरे में उम्मीद की किरण के रूप में दिखायी दे रही है कि तीन वर्षों के बाद आज कांग्रेस के जो हमारे दोस्त बोल रहे हैं मैंने जगेश भाई को सुना, रमन साहब को सुना, जाधव साहब को सुना और इन लोगों ने जिस बात को कहा है, वह एक उम्मीद की किरण है अंधेरे में कि आज आप भी जाग रहे हैं। आज आप भी यह सवाल इस बजट के बारे में खड़े कर रहे हैं, आप आप भी पूछ रहे हैं कि आपने वायदा तो कुछ किया था, लेकिन अंजाम कुछ निकल रहा है। इन तीन वर्षों का हिसाब-किताब आप भी पूछ रहे हैं। इसलिए मुझे उम्मीद है और हम बराबर मानते हैं कि इस देश के अंदर अभी भी वह आजादी के समय का सपना खत्म नहीं हुआ है। कुछ लोग यह सपना खत्म करना चाहते थे, लेकिन वह सपना खत्म नहीं हो रहा है। यह आज मेरे लिए सबसे बड़ी खुशी की बात है जोकि मैंने आज के, कल के और परसों के कांग्रेस सदस्यों के भाषणों में सुनी थी। इसलिए उपाध्यक्ष महोदया, मैं आपके माध्यम से सरकार से पूछना चाहूंगा कि आपने जितने आंकड़े दिए हैं, हमारा आपसे बहुत मतभेद था, आज भी है, लेकिन एक बात पर हम आपके साथ थे और वह यह कि आपने कहा था कि हम इस देश के अंदर फिस्कल डेफेसिट को, इकॉनोमी को ठीक करेंगे, दुरुस्त करें। आप वह कहते थे बार-बार कि आपने जो गड़बड़ की है, हम मान भी लें कि हमने सारी गड़बड़ की थी, लेकिन आपने एक बात कही थी और हम भी चाहते थे कि देश की इकॉनोमी को, देश के फिस्कल डेफेसिट को आप ठीक करें। आज फिस्कल डेफेसिट के मामले का क्या हुआ? कहां, पर पहुंच गया है वह, क्या आपने कभी इस बारे में गंभीरता से सोचा है और यह कहां तक जाएगा इसके बारे में सोचा है आप किस दिशा में इस देश की पूरी इकॉनोमी को ले जा रहे हैं?

उपाध्यक्ष महोदया, बड़ी-बड़ी बातों को कहने का न मेरे पास समय है और न मैं उसके विश्लेषण में जाना चाहता हूं। मैं आंकड़ों में भी नहीं जाना चाहता हूं। आंकड़े आप जितने चाहे दे लो, आंकड़ों में जितनी फेर-बदल करना चाहो करलो, लेकिन मैं एक बात बड़ी गंभीरता से सरकार के वित्त मंत्री को कहना चाहता हूं कि अगर 1991–92 और 1992–93 में भी आप चेत गए होते तो आज यह नतीजा नहीं निकला होता। हम तब भी कह रहे थे, आपका 1992–

93 का जब बजट आया था तो हमने कहा था कि यह गलत बयानबाजी है। हमने आपसे कहा था कि खर्चों को कम कर के मत दिखाओ। वित्त मंत्री जी आपको मौका मिला और वह मौका था और करीब-करीब सारे देश के लोग यह मान रहे थे कि अर्थ-व्यवस्था एक ऐसी चीज हो गयी है इस देश के अंदर जिसको कि ठीक करना अपना एक तरह से राष्ट्रीय कर्त्तव्य बन गया है। सब लोगों ने यह सोचा था। उपाध्यक्ष महोदया, मैं उस बहस में नहीं जाना चाहता हूं कि अर्थ-व्यवस्था कहां से बिगड़ी और किसने बिगाड़ी? सब कुछ ठीक चल रहा था कि अचानक बिगड़ गयी। उपाध्यक्ष महोदया, यह बात पुरानी है और उसे मैं दोहराना नहीं चाहता, लेकिन मैं सिर्फ एक मुद्दे पर वित्त मंत्री जी से पूछना चाहता हूं कि वित्त मंत्री जी आपका फिस्कल डेफेसिट कहां पहुंच गया है और इसके कहां तक पहुंचने की संभावना है, जरा इसके बारे में भी सोचा है? वर्ष 1991 का बार-बार जिक्र होता है, वर्ष 1992 का बार-बार जिक्र होता है, लेकिन उपाध्यक्ष महोदया, कोई सरकार चल नहीं सकती रेवेन्य डेफेसिट को बिना ठीक किए हुए। मैं यह बात बड़ी गंभीरता से कह रहा हूं। उपाध्यक्ष महोदया, वर्ष 1989-90 में इतना मामला नहीं बिगड़ा था, 1991 जोकि सबसे बुरा साल था, उस समय के आर्थिक विश्लेषण के हिसाब से 18 हजार करोड़ का रेवेन्यू डेफेसिट था और आज वह रेवेन्य डेफेसिट कहां पहुंचा दिया है? आपने उस रेवेन्यू डेफेसिट को 34 हजार करोड़ पर पहुंचा दिया है। सारी विफलता के बावजद 1991 में 18 हजार करोड़ का रेवेन्यू डेफेसिट था और आज सारी सफलता के बावजूद रेवेन्यु डेफेसिट 34 हजार करोड़ है। महोदया, मैं अथ-शास्त्री नहीं हूं, इसलिए मैं जानना चाहता हूं कि दुनिया का कौन सा अर्थ शास्त्री इस बात को कहने के लिए तैयार है कि आज हमारे देश में सबसे सफल आर्थिक नीति चल रही है? मैं वित्त मंत्री जी को कहना चाहता हूं कि आपने सदन की गरिमा को समाप्त किया है। सदन में बजट लाने के पहले पूरे देश में कीमतों को बढ़ाने का काम आपने किया है? हम इसलिए खामोश रहे क्योंकि हम जानते थे कि तीन साल के हिसाब से जो आपने राष्ट्र के लोगों के सामने कसम खाकर कहा था कि तीन सालों में हम देश की तमाम अर्थ-नीति को ठीक कर देंगे, उसका जवाब आपको सदन में देना होगा। इसलिए मैं आपसे जानना चाहता हूं कि इन सवालों का क्या जवाब आपके पास हैं? आप इन सवालों के ऊपर क्या कहना चाहते हैं और अगर कुछ कहना नहीं चाहते हैं तो मैं आपसे एक अर्ज करना चाहता हूं कि अभी भी मौका है, उपाध्यक्ष महोदया, बार-बार कहा जाता है कि इस देश में आर्थिक संकट आ गया था। क्या मैं पूछ सकता हूं माननीय वित्त मंत्री जी कि अगर आर्थिक संकट आया इस देश के अंदर तो हम लोग एक परिवार में रहते हैं और जिस साल खेती से आमदनी नहीं होती है या दूसरे कामों से आमदनी नहीं होती है तो उस साल परिवार में कह दिया जाता है कि इस साल साग-भाजी कम कर दो। आपने कौनसा कदम उठाया इस देश के पूंजीपतियों के लिए? आपने कौनसा कदम उठाया, जिससे आप इस देश के लोगों को कह सकें कि हमारी वित्तीय स्थिति खराब है, हम कठिन समय से गुजर रहे हैं इसलिए खर्चा कम करो? खर्चे में एक रुपया नहीं। हम आपसे कहना चाहते हैं इस सदन के माध्यम से कि इस पूरे देश में जो सुविधाभोगी लोग थे, जिन लोगों की जिन्दगी बेहतर थी, उनके ऊपर कोई अंकुश लगाने का काम नहीं हुआ है। मारा कौन गया? इस देश का गरीब मारा गया। मारा कौन गया? इस देश का किसान मारा गया। मारा कौन गया? वह लोग जो बेरोजगार हैं।

उपसभापति महोदया, मैं जानना चाहता हूं, आखिर कौनसा सपना लकर हमने हजारों, लाखों लोगों को कुर्बानी की बलिवेदी पर चढ़ाकर इस देश में आजादी की लड़ाई लड़ी थी? उस समय एक ही सपना था, जो गांधी ने इस देश के लोगों को दिखाया था, कि

अगर यह मुल्क आजाद होगा तो दुनिया को तरक्की के रास्ते पर हम जाएंगे, दुनिया के कंधे से कंधा मिलाकर अपनी मंजिल को पाएंगे। लेकिन हम पहुंचे कहां? पंडित जवाहर लाल नेहरू ने 1947 में जब इस बात का जिक्र भारत के संसद के दोनों सदनों को मिलाकर इसी सेंट्रल हाल में किया था कि हमने किस्मत से बाजी पाई। तो वह महज भाषण नहीं था बल्कि आजाद हिन्दुस्तान के 50 करोड़ लोगों के उन सपनों को साकार करने का दायित्व उन्होंने अपने कंधों पर लिया था कि हम उस बाजी को सही रूप में दिखाकर प्राप्त करना चाहेंगे। आज हमने कहां पहुचा दिया अपने को आज दुनिया में सबसे बड़ा देश होने का हम दावा करते हैं चीन के बाद, लेकिन आज इस देश की स्थिति कहां पहुच गई है श इस देश की स्थिति आज कहा पहुंच गई है, उपसभापति महोदया, जहां कि इतनी जल्दी देश के विकास का काम करना फिलहाल संभव नहीं दिख रहा है।

आज हिन्दुस्तान में दुनिया के सबसे ज्यादा बेरोजगार हैं। करीब 20-22 करोड़ लोग बेरोजगार हैं, चार करोड़ लोग बी.ए., एम.ए. की डिग्री लेकर, डाक्टर और इंजीनियर बनकर इस देश में बेरोजगार होकर घूम रहे हैं। मैं कांग्रेस के साथी को बधाई देना चाहता हूं, आज जाधव जी ने यहां यह सवाल उठाया कि बेरोजगारों का क्या हो रहा है? बजट के आंकड़ों में मत फंसाओ हमें। यह 4 परसेंट का आंकड़ा इसको कर दिया 7.4 परसेंट, मैं इन आंकड़ों में नहीं जाना चाहता, लेकिन मैं पूछना चाहता हूं कि बेरोजगारों के लिए इस बजट में क्या किया गया है? मैं जानना चाहता हूं, इस देश के 80 प्रतिशत लोग जो गांव में रहते हैं उनके लिए क्या हो रहा है? गांव में जहां सड़क नहीं, जहां हास्पीटल नहीं, जहां स्कूल नहीं, जहां मां बच्चे के लिए प्रसूति गृह का इंतजाम नहीं। इन सवालों के ऊपर आपने कौनसा काम किया है इस बजट में? कौनसी जिम्मेदारी आपने ली है गांव के लोगों के लिए, जिससे उनका मनोबल बढ़े?

उपसभापति महोदया, मैं बड़ी गंभीर समस्या का यहां जिक्र कर रहा हूं। इस देश के खजाने को भरने के लिए जनता को लूटने का काम मत करो। अगर आपने हिन्दुस्तान का इतिहास पढ़ा होगा तो आपने जाना होगा कि मुल्क तब तब गुलाम हुआ जब तब इस देश के राजा-महाराजाओं के खजाने भरे पड़े थे, जयपुर और ग्वालियर के खजाने दौलत से भरे पड़े थे। यह मुल्क तब गुलाम हुआ जब दौलत कहीं कैद थी और हिन्दुस्तान के गरीब आदमी को यह लगता था कि इस राज से हमारा क्या रिश्ता है, इस खजाने से मेरा क्या मतलब है। आज इस बजट पर जब भाषण हो रहे हैं तो प्रेस दीर्घा खाली है और खाली क्यों है, इसलिए कि लोगों को लग रहा है इस बजट का मतलब क्या है। इस सदन में हो क्या रहा है? कीमतें तो सदन के बाहर ही बढ़ जाती हैं। कीमतों का कोई ध्यान नहीं रखा जा रहा है। फिर, आप कहते हैं कि हमने टैक्सेशन का बड़ा हिसाब किताब किया है। लेकिन, इस टैक्सेशन से कितने लोगों को लाभ मिल रहा है? इस देश की कुल आबादी के हिसाब से अगर देखें तो इस टैक्सेशन के अंदर 0.6 परसेंट लोग आते हैं। यह पूरा बजट आपने 0.6 लोगों को खुश करने के लिए बनाया है, लेकिन 99.4 परसेंट लोगों का कोई हिसाब-किताब इस बजट में क्यों नहीं है? मैं जानना चाहता हूं मंत्री महोदय से।

आप कितने नारे लगा दो, कितनी तारीफ बांधो, लेकिन इस बजट के अन्दर, बल्कि पिछले तीन-चार वर्षों से लगातार जब से आपका बजट आ रहा है, देख रहे हैं कि गांवों के लिए कुछ नहीं। मैं हिन्दुस्तान के ग्रामीण इलाकों में जाता हूं और आज भी इन गांवों में जा रहा हूं। अभी दो दिन पहले भी गांव के हिस्से में था। गांव में यही सवाल मुझसे पूछा जा रहा है कि हमारी सड़क का क्या होगा, हमारे स्कूल का क्या होगा, हमारी बिजली का क्या होगा, हमारे पानी का क्या होगा? सिर्फ बात वहीं तक होती तो हम चुप रहते, लेकिन

जो पिछड़ा इलाका रहा है वह और पिछड़ा होता जा रहा है। आपका यह एक इंस्टीटयूट है बंबई में लकड़वाड़ा इंस्टीट्यूट। उस इंस्टीट्यूट का पूरा खाता मुझे अभी कुछ दिन पहले देखने को मिला। हिन्दुस्तान में जो क्षेत्रीय असंतुलन है, उसके लिए पूरे हिन्दुस्तान के नक्शे को बांटा गया, वह क्षेत्रीय असंतुलन इतना बिगड़ता जा रहा है, जिसका अंदाजा नहीं लगाया जा सकता। मैं सिर्फ एक आंकड़ा देना चाहूंगा कि आजाद हिन्दुस्तान में 375 जिले आज क्षेत्रीय असंतुलन की उस परिधि में हैं, जहां पर विकास की दर, जो आपने तय करके देश को बताने का काम किया, उसका 1110 हिस्सा भी वहां विकास का नहीं पहुंच पाया। जब यह बात मैं कह रहा हूं तो मेरे सामने हिन्दुस्तान का वह नक्शा घूमता नजर आ रहा है, जहां आज तमाम विप्लव का दौर चल रहा है, आप उसे नेक्सलाइट आन्दोलन कह सकते हो, आप उसे जातीय-धार्मिक आंदोलन कह सकते हो, लेकिन ये तमाम वे इलाके हैं, हिन्दुस्तान के जिन इलाकों में लोग शांति से बैठे नहीं, तमाम परेशानियां हैं और उन परेशानियों की एक ही वजह है कि विकास उन तक पहुंच नहीं पाया, विकास उनके दरवाजे को दस्तक नहीं दे पाया, विकास को उन्होंने देखा नहीं कि विकास क्या होता है। इस संसद के अंदर जहां आप अपनी बात कह रहे हैं और हम भी हैं, अपने को संसद का एक हिस्सा मानते हैं, उपसभापति महोदया, लेकिन यह संसद चंद लोगों के हितों की रक्षा करने के लिए नहीं है। आप अगर यह सोचते हैं कि हम सिर्फ 3 परसेंट लोगों को, 0.6 परसेंट लोगों को खुश करके, हिन्दुस्तान के पूंजीपतियों को खुश करके, अगर 3 परसेंट की परिधि में आप घूमते रहेंगे तो यकीन मानिए कि हिन्दुस्तान की संसद पर लोगों का कितना विश्वास रह जाएगा, इस पर हम सारे लोग बहस करने को मजबूर होंगे। इसलिए आज फिर मैं खास तौर से अपने कांग्रेसी मित्रों से गुजारिश करना चाहता हूं कि एक बार फिर यह मौका मुझे मिला है कि आपसे यह गुजारिश कर सकूं कि इस बात पर बहस होनी चाहिए कि आखिर विकास कहां जाएगा, किन लोगों के पास पहुचेगा? विकास अगर सिर्फ 3 प्रतिशत लोगों तक सीमित है, अगर विकास और इस बजट का हिस्सा 0.6 परसेंट लोगों तक सीमित है तो हमारा बहस करने का कोई औचित्य सदन में बनता है या नहीं, इस सवाल पर सारे लोग गंभीरता से सोचें। याद रखिए, इतिहास किसी को माफ नहीं करता। हम भले ही अपने को इनसे अलग रख लें, हम भले अपने को आपसे अलग रख लें कि यह वित्त मंत्री का काम है, मेरा काम नहीं है, लेकिन पूरा देश इस संसद की ओर देखता है, पूरा देश हमें, आपको और सबको मिलाकर देखता है कि हम उनकी समस्याओं के लिए इस देश की संसद में कौन सी आवाज उठा रहे हैं। इसलिए, उपसभापति महोदया, मैं माननीय वित्त मंत्री जी से कहना चाहूंगा कि वित्त मंत्री जी, अभी मौका है आपके सामने गंभीरता से सोचने का। चुनाव दिन-प्रतिदिन नजदीक आते जा रहे हैं। आप कोई काम नहीं कर पाओगे, आप चाहोगे तो भी नहीं कर पाओगे उस काम को। इसलिए कठिन समय में कठिन निर्णय लेने के लिए आप तैयार हो जाएं। आप तय कर लो कि हिंदुस्तान 3 प्रतिशत लोगों का होगा या 97 प्रतिशत लोगों का होगा। यह फैसला करने का आज आपके लिए मौका है और अगर आप यह फैसला कर सके तब तो इस बजट का कोई औचित्य होगा वरना धीरे-धीरे इस बजट की प्रासंगिकता इस मुल्क के लोगों के लिए खत्म हो जाएगी।

इसलिए मैं आपसे कहना चाहता था कि दो-तीन बातों के ऊपर आप गंभीरता से सोचने का प्रयास करें। एक तो भारत के उद्योगों को आप कैसे बढ़ा सकते हो। आप बार-बार कह रहे हो कि हमने यह किया, हमने यह किया, मैं फिर कह रहा हूं कि वह बहस का मुद्दा नहीं है। मैं मानता हूं कि वह काम, जो आप वायदा कर रहे हो, वह हो पाएगा नहीं, लेकिन रिस्ट्रक्चरिंग का काम जब तक आप

नहीं करोगे तब तक आपकी इंडस्ट्री बढ़ नहीं सकती, आपका उत्पादन बढ़ नहीं सकता। आज आपने इस देश को सट्टे-बाजार में परिवर्तित कर दिया है। आज एक चौक पर बैठा हिन्दुस्तान का जो बेरोजगार आदमी है, वह भी कहता है कि हमें हजार-पांच सौ रुपए, दे दो, हम स्टॉक-एक्सचेंज में पैसा लगाएंगे। आपने केसीनो खोल दिया इस देश के अंदर। अब खुला है या नहीं खुला है, यह तो बहस का मुद्दा है, लेकिन प्रचार यह हो रहा है कि दिल्ली के बगल में एक पांच सितारा होटल खुलेगा, जिसमें केसीनो खोला जाएगा।

देश बड़ी मुश्किल से बनता है। जब अंग्रेजों को हटाने के लिए गांधी जी ने आन्दोलन चलाया था, तो वह कोई मामूली काम नहीं था, लेकिन एक संघर्ष की प्रक्रिया से इस देश को इस रास्ते पर वह लेकर गए, जहां पर इन सारी चीजों के ऊपर रोक लगाई गई। क्या आप सोचते हैं कि हम सब यहां पर बेवकूफ लोग बैठे हुए हैं? क्या राजीव गांधी बेवकूफ थे, इंदिरा गांधी बेवकूफ थीं, जवाहर लाल बेवकूफ थे? इन सारे लोगों को भी वह रास्ता मालूम था, जिस रास्ते पर आप ले जाना चाहते हैं। तत्काल पैसा पाने के बहुत से रास्ते हैं, जिन रास्तों पर चला जा सकता है। आप देश को बाजार में मत बदलिए। अभी अगेश भाई ने दस-पन्द्रह दिन पहले कहा था यहां कि प्राइवेट एयरलाइंस में शराब भी दी जा रही है। जिस शराब के लिए हिन्दुस्तान की आधी आबादी, जो आजादी की लड़ाई लड़ रही थी, उन्होंने शराब की दुकानों पर जाकर अपनी गिरफ्तारी दी थी, आज उसी देश की सरकार यहां के हवाई जहाजों में शराब बेचने की अनुमति दे रही है। कहां हम पहुंचते चले जा रहे हैं? थाइलैंड से सिर्फ एक ही कदम पीछे रह गए हैं हम लोग। हमने पहले भी कहा था कि इस तरह के माहौल को पैदा करते-करते उसका एक लाजिकल अंजाम होता है और वह अंजाम आज हमें मजबूर कर रहा है। लेकिन मुझे अभी भी खुशी है कि आप सारे लोग इस सवाल पर जम रहे हैं, इन सवालों को छेड़ रहे हैं और वह छेड़ने के काम का असर वित्त मंत्री जी पर हो, तब तक मैं समझूंगा कि उसका कोई मतलब होगा, वरना हम कुछ भी कहते रह जाएं हम उसका कोई मतलब निकाल नहीं पाएंगे। लेकिन मैं जो आपके स्ट्रक्चर की बात कर रहा था, इसके बारे में आपको गंभीरता से सोचना होगा। आपके खर्च कहीं घट नहीं हैं। इसलिए मैं सबसे पहले आपको इण्डस्ट्रियल स्ट्रक्चर के बारे में एक राय देना चाहूंगा कि अगर आप सचमुच में औद्योगिक विकास करना चाहते है (समय की घंटी)–

उपसभापति : छः मिनट और हैं आपके।

श्री दिग्विजय सिंह : आप सचमुच में यह चाहते है हमें विकास की तरफ ले जाना चाहते हैं, तो आपको एरिया चुनना होगा। आप अगर 1992 और 93 के बीच के आंकड़े देखें तो हमारा कौन सा एरिया था जहां हम आगे बढ़े थे। वह एक एरिया था-एक्सपोर्ट का। एक्सपोर्ट के मामले में आप चायना का उदाहरण लें। मैं आपसे कह रहा हूं कि दुनियां में आज हिन्दुस्तान का बाजार जहां तक श्रम का बाजार है, मजदूर का बाजार है वह सबसे ज्यादा सस्ता बाजार है। आज चायना में एक्सपोर्ट कहां से कहां पहुंच गया। वे अस्सी एक्सपोर्ट 22 बिलियन डालर से लेकर चले थे और आज करीब 80 बिलियन डालर से ऊपर जाकर खड़ा है। हम 1992–93 में चले थे 8 बिलियन पर और इधर 20 बिलियन की हम खवाहिश कर रहे हैं। लेकिन मैं आपसे यह कह रहा हूं कि यह एक ऐसा इलाका है, एक ऐसा क्षेत्र है जहां आप अगर थोड़ी गंभीरता से इसके ऊपर सोचें तो विकास की तरक्की को आप आगे ले जा सकते हैं। आप श्रम की कीमत को लोगों तक पहुंचा सकते हैं, लोगों को काम मिल सकता है। एम्प्लोयमेंट का एक बहुत बड़ा रास्ता

[श्री दिग्विजय सिंह]

इस रास्ते से खोला जा सकता है। लेकिन वह कोई काम हो नहीं पा रहा है। पहले बहुत कुछ इंसेंटिव भी दिया गया, वह इंसेंटिव भी आपने विड्रा कर लिया। लेकिन इसके लिए कौन आपको मजबूर कर रहा है? आप एक बार सदन को, देश को विश्वास में लेकर कहते क्यों नहीं, आपको इंपोर्ट ड्यूटी करने की क्या जरूरत पड़ी थी, हम यह जानना चाहते हैं आपसे ? हिन्दुस्तान के लोगों पर तो आपने एक्साइज ड्यूटी बढ़ा दिया, आपने कोई रिलीफ नहीं दिया। हमारे जो बड़े घराने थे उन घरानों के बारे में जब मैं कहता तो मैं हिन्दुस्तान के पूंजीपतियों को नहीं बल्कि मैं सार्वजनिक क्षेत्र की बात कर रहा हूं। सेल जैसा संगठन—स्टील आथॉरिटी आफ इंडिया लि., आज अपने लोहे को बेचने में मजबूर पा रहा है और आपने इंपोर्ट की ड्यूटी घटा दी। मुझे मालूम है वित्त मंत्री जी, यह दबाव आप पर कहां से पड़ता है। लेकिन मैं उस दबाव के बारे में आपसे नहीं कहना चाहता। मैं तो आपसे यह कहना चाहता हूं कि आपके सामने एक मौका है जिस पर आप फैसला ले सकते हैं और वह मौका है कि आप पूरे देश को विश्वास में लें, पूरे देश को आप बता सकें कि आखिर हो क्या रहा है। बड़ी-बड़ी बातों का जिक्र मैं नहीं करना चाहता। लेकिन आज यह बात सही है या नहीं। मैं कोई पूंजीपतियों का समर्थक नहीं हूं। आपको मालूम है, जब हमारी सरकार थी और जिस मंत्रालय में आप थे मैं उसी मंत्रालय में था और उस मंत्रालय में हमने हिंदुस्तान के पूंजीपतियों पर 1200 से 1800 करोड़ रुपया टैक्स लिया था इससे पहले कि हम आई. एम.एफ. से पैसा मांगने जाते। यह बात आपकी जानकारी में है। लेकिन मैं आपसे पूछना चाहता हूं कि क्या हिन्दुस्तान के यह बड़े पूंजीपति घराने टिक पा रहे हैं इस मल्टीनेशनल के सामने? आप दुनियां में मल्टीनेशनल बनाना चाहते थे टाटा को और टाटा हिन्दुस्तान लीवर के सामने घुटने टेक देता है। कहता है कि अब हम नहीं चला पाएंगे। यह टाटा कहता है। तो हिन्दुस्तान के आम पूंजीपतियों का क्या होगा, इसका आप अंदाजा लगा सकते हैं। हमने तब कहा था तो हिन्दुस्तान के पूंजीपतियों को भी लगा था कि हम नई आर्थिक नीति का विरोध कर रहे हैं। लेकिन मैंने आपसे पहले भी कहा था, मैं चाहता था कि मैं गलत साबित होता, लेकिन दुर्भाग्य से आज हम सही साबित हो रहे हैं। एक बात याद रखिए कि आज यह भी जो आपको मौका मिला हुआ है कि हिन्दुस्तान की किस्मत आज ठीक है। इस देश में कभी ऐसा नहीं हुआ कि लगातार 6–6 बार मानसून सफल हुआ हो। यह साही आर्थिक प्रगति जिसका ढिंढोरा आप पीट रहे हैं उसमें एक बार हिन्दुस्तान की प्रकृति ने आपका साथ दिया। हम खुशनसीब हैं, आप जिसे जो कह लें। मानसून ने साथ दिया आपका, इस देश का साथ दिया, वरना इस देश की क्या हालत होती, इसका आप अंदाजा लगा सकते हैं।

जो फॉरेन रिजर्व के बारे में इतना चिल्लाया जा रहा है, मैं उसकी तफसील में नहीं जाना चाहता। लेकिन एक बात मैं कहना चाहता हूं। यह ऐसा पैसा है जो दो घंटे की चुटकी में इस देश के बाहर निकल जाने वाला है। इसलिए मैं आज आपको चेतावनी द रहा हूं कि यह सारा पैसा ऐसा पैसा हैं, सट्टा बाजार का पैसा है, उन लोगों का पैसा है जो इस देश में तत्काल कुछ पैसा लगाकर तत्काल कुछ कीमत लेना चाहते हैं, कुछ फायदा लेना चाहते हैं। उसका आंकड़ा भी आपको दे दूं। मैं उसके आंकड़े आप चाहें तो दे देता, लेकिन मैं नहीं चाहता क्योंकि आपके पास ये आकड़े मौजूद हैं। वह पैसा कहां से आया था, यह आपको पता है, कौन सा पैसा लगा हुआ है, ये सारी बातें आपकी जानकारी में हैं। इसलिए मैं कहना चाहता हू कि खुदा न खास्ता अगर मानसून ने हमारा साथ नहीं दिया तो यह जो सारा का सारा रिजर्व मनी आपके पास है, यह आपके हाथ से जाता रहेगा, आप बैठे रह जाएंगे, तब फिर हम उसी हालत में पहुच जाएंगे जिस हालत

में पहले थे। इसलिए मैं आपसे कहना चाहता हूं कि आप इस बारे में गंभीरता से सोचें।

एक बात मैं और आपको इसी सिलसिले में कहना चाहता हूं हालांकि मैं इसका समर्थक नहीं था लेकिन आपने लोन ले लिया। 1981 में एक गलती की थी, 2.5 बिलियन का लोन लेने से आपने मना कर दिया। उस समय आपका यह बड़ा पापुलिस्ट स्लोगन था लेकिन आप मंत्रालय को चला रहे हो, आप तत्काल उस का रिपेमेंट समय से पहले करना चाहता हो। इस गलतफहमी में आप मत रहिए कि जो लोग जिम्मेंदारी से भागते हैं, इतिहास उन को कभी माफ नहीं करता। आपने एक नीति चलाई थी कि इस लोन के माध्यम से देश की अर्थ-व्यवस्था को ठीक करना चाहते हैं, लेकिन अखबारों के माध्यम से, प्लानिंग मिनिस्टर के और फाईनेंस मिनिस्टर के जो बयान मैंने देखे कि आप कर्ज का पैसा लौटा रहे हैं।....

एक माननीय सदस्य : इससे बड़ा लोन लेना चाहते हैं।.... (**व्यवधान**)

श्री दिग्विजय सिंह : इससे बड़ी कोई और गलती नहीं हो सकती है। इसलिए आप इसके बारे में सोचें। मैं भारत के एक नागरिक की हैसियत से आपको सचेत कर रहा हू। इस काम को कैसे किया जाए, इस पर आप गभीरता से सोचें। कोई जल्दी-बाजी में ऐसा कदम न उठाए जिससे आप को और इस देश को आगे जाकर नुकसान उठाना पड़े।

उपसभापति महोदया, आपकी अनुमति से मैं एक और बात माननीय मंत्री जी के सामने कह देना चाहता हूं। अगर आप सचमुच में इस बहस को सार्थक बनाना चाहते हो, बहस का सही रूप इस देश को लोगों तक पहुंचाना चाहते हो तो चार सवालों के बारे में आप गंभीरता से सोचो। एक तो हिन्दुस्तान का सवाल है कि कितने ही लोग बेघर, बेछत आज भी जमीन पर पड़े हुए हैं जिसका अंदाजा आप नहीं लगा सकते। हम एक ओर अय्याशी के तमाम साधन जुटाए और दूसरी ओर लोगों के लिए छत मुहैया न करा पाए, यह बड़ी शर्मनाक बात है।....

उपसभापति : दिग्विजय सिंह जी, अब जरा संक्षप में कह दीजिए अपनी बात।

श्री दिग्विजय सिंह : मैं समाप्त ही कर रहा हूं महोदया। दूसरी बात है सोशल सैक्युरिटी सिस्टम की। आप मानें या न मानें, हिन्दुस्तान आज भी दुनिया में गरीब देश है। जो अमीर देश हैं वहां भी सोशल सैक्युरिटी सिस्टम है। जहां चैरिटेबल संस्थाए हैं, उनमें भी सोशल सैक्युरिटी सिस्टम है। लेकिन आपके बजट में सोशल सैक्युरिटी के लिए कोई पैसा नहीं है। तो हिन्दुस्तान की गरीबी को देखते हुए इसका कोई तालमेल आप बैठाइए और सोशल सैक्युरिटी के बारे में सोचिए।

तीसरी बात जो मैं आपसे गुजारिश करना चाहता हूं वह यह है कि आप पूर्वी भारत को किस तरह से नेगलेक्ट कर रहे हैं, इसका आप ध्यान रखें। जब मैं पूर्वी भारत कह रहा हू तो उसमें बिहार है, बगाल है, पूर्वांचल है, असम है। जो डेवलपमेंट का पैसा आपने निकाला वह कितना कम है यह आप देखें। एक भी काम पिछले दो तीन वर्षों से इस इलाके में नहीं हो रहा है। उल्टे यहां के जो स्थापित कारखाने हैं वे भी बंद हो रहे हैं। चाहे सिंदरी फर्टिलाइजर हो, एच० ई०सी० रांची हो जिसको पंडित जवाहरलाल जी ने बनाया था उनका भाषण आज भी मुझे याद है, मैं तब लड़का था, उन्होंने कहा था कि यह हिन्दुस्तान की प्रगति का मंदिर बनेगा। आज उसी एच० ई० सी० में ताला पड़ा हुआ है। एच०ई०सी० बंद होने जा रहा है. माननीय रामलखन जी बैठे हुए हैं, आप देखिए, मुजफ्फरपुर का आइ०डी०पी० एल० बंद हो रहा है। रेलवे बजट में आपने एक मीटर भी लाइन देने के लिए प्रावधान नहीं रखा है। आज पूर्वी भारत के ये इलाके जो अशान्ति के इलाके हैं, अब भी शान्ति से बैठे रहें, जैसे आप अपेक्षा रख रहें हैं, तो आप उनके लिए कुछ करते। इसलिए मैं आपसे कहना चाहूंगा कि आप इस बजट में कुछ उनके लिए करें।

[श्री दिग्विजय सिंह]

आपने इशारा किया कि मेरा समय समाप्त हो रहा है, इसलिए मैं आपसे क्षमा चाहता हूं, एक मिनट और लेने के लिए। लेकिन एक बात याद रखनी होगी कि आर्थिक नीति पर दुनिया के जो देश चले उनके नतीजे क्या हुए है उसका एक उदाहरण है, जमाइका का राष्ट्रपति मैकमिलन। वह मैकमिलन यहां के तमाम लोगों का दोस्त है और आपके वित्त मंत्री मनमोहन सिंह जी का भी दोस्त है। जब मनमोहन सिंह सेक्रेटरी जनरल थे साउथ कमीशन में तब वह उनके साथ हिले-मिले व्यक्ति थे। मनमोहन सिंह जी पहले विरोध कर रहे थे और मैकमिलन ने भी अभी कुछ दिन पहले क्या कहा था आपको मालूम है? उन्होंने कहा था भगवान हमें सुबुद्धि देता उस समय तो मैं उनके चंगुल से बच जाता और आज हम अपने सही रास्ते पर होते। हिन्दुस्तान तब भी बड़ा सहनशील देश था और आज भी है। आपने जो गलतियां की उसका जो खामियाजा भोगेंगे हिन्दुस्तान के लोग उसके बावजूद वे आपको माफ करने के लिए अब भी तैयार हैं बशर्ते आप इस मुल्क के उन इलाकों में जिनका जिक्र मैंने किया उन गरीब मजबूर लोगों की जिनकी आवाज उठाने वाला कोई नहीं है देश में, अगर सरकार उस आवाज के ऊपर सोचे और उस विषय पर विचार करे जिससे उनको ऐसा लगे कि सरकार ने सोच कर, समझ कर कुछ देने का काम किया है मैं समझता हूं इस बजट की सार्थकता होगी। वरना हमारे जैसे लोगों का इस बजट को समर्थन देने का कोई सवाल ही नहीं उठता। साथ ही साथ आप को मैं उन आने वाले दिनों के लिए आगाह करता हूं कि देश इस काम के लिए आपको माफ नहीं करेगा। आप शायद इसको जितना बढ़ा ले और जितना भत्ता लें, दो प्रतिशत जनता से तालियां बजवा ले लेकिन जब तक देश की 97 फीसदी जनताका हिसाब इस बजट के खजाने के खाते में नहीं होगा देश के लोगों का मनोबल टूट जायेगा और मैं नहीं चाहता कि इस देश के लोगों का मनोबल टूटे। मैं चाहता हूं गांधी जी के सपनों का भारत फिर एक बार बने और इस बात पर कांग्रेस पार्टी भी साथ दे हमारा ताकि देश के उन हजारों, लाखों शहीद जिन्होंने अपनी कुर्बानी राष्ट्र की आजादी की लड़ाई में दी उनके सपने साकार हो सकें। इन शब्दों के साथ मैं आपका बहुत-बहुत धन्यवाद करता हूं।

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Kotaiah, Please be brief. There is only one hour left for your party. I have got many names. One hour is for your party, not for you. Don't misunderstand it.

SHRI PRAGADA KOTAIAH (Andhra Pradesh): Madam, I am not speaking on behalf of Andhra Pradesh or any other State, I am speaking on behalf of the handloom weavers all over the country.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You can take 10 minutes for that.

SHRI PRAGADA KOTAIAH: Madam, in 1993-94, a provision of Rs. 259 crores was made for the handloom weavers. In 1994-95, it was increased to Rs. 315 crores. So, only Rs. 56 crores were increased. But this is also misleading Out of Rs. 315 crores, Rs. 138 crores are meant for consumers of Janata cloth in this country. The handloom weavers are practically unemployed throughout the year. Their unemployment is taken advantage of by the Government for production of Janata cloth Madam, we went to the Supreme Court for minimum wages. The writ petion was admitted by the Supreme Court in

[The Vice-Chairman (Shri Satya Prakash Malaviya) in the Chair].

1987. But it is still reading. If the Supreme Court is kind enough to take up the issue and decide the question of wages for production of Janata cloth the handloom weavers all over the country would be able to get more that Rs. 25 crores. It is claimed that we are spending more and more either for eradication of unemployment or for generation of employment.

I am very glad that the Minister of State for Textiles has agreed to set up 3000 Handloom Development Centres all over the country over a period of 4 years so as to provide employment to almost 30 lakh handloom workers who are dependent on 7.5 lakh looms for their livelihood. But to see that these Centres work well, the following facilities should be made available to them: (i) allow a discount of 10 per cent on all the raw materials purchased by these Centres; (ii) the marketing development assistance that is provided shall be 25 per cent of the credit limit sanctioned to them by the NABARD; (iii) the cost of rent and establishment charges must be borne by the Government for a period of 5 years;

The Vice-Chairman (Syed Sibtey Razi) in the Chair]

(iv) representatives of societies producing exportable varieties of yarn should be allowed to participate in the buyers and sellers meet and fairs in the world; (v) duty draw backs and such other incentives should also be provided to such societies. The problem faced by the handloom workers is that they are not able to get yarn at reasonable rates. The magazine, *Frontline* of the *Hindu*, this month, published an article detailing the woes of the handloom weavers and also the prices of yarn. It has stated the following: for 20 counts Rs. 215 to Rs. 275, for 40, Rs. 280 to Rs. 330, for 60, Rs. 510 to Rs. 570, for 80, Rs. 660 to Rs. 720, for 100, Rs. 775 to Rs. 860. Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, you may kindly note the unusual and unprecedented increase in the price of yarn. What are the steps taken to stabilise the price of yarn? No assessment regarding the actual price of yarn has been made so far. No assessment regarding the profits collected by the mills and middlemen has been made. No measures have been taken to check undue exploitation by the mill owners and the middlemen. Yarn is covered by the Essential Commodities Act. But we do not have dual pricing in the case of yarn as is done in the case of sugar, cement, paper, iron and also rice. Cotton export which was allowed at the beginning of the year has been stopped. Mills have been allowed to import 5 lakh bales of long staple cotton and extra long staple cotton. Mills have been allowed to mix about 10 per cent BVSP for production of cotton yarn. The Textile Commissioner is armed with powers to check hoarding of cotton. But all these benefit the textile mills. How these measures have helped the handloom weavers is not known. The Indian Cotton Mills Federation has agreed to supply yarn at reduced prices. The Mills have agreed to supply 10 million kgs. of yarn. Sir, as per the estimates of the Planning Commission, there are more than 40 lakhs of handloom mills in our country and they require 5610 million kgs. of yarn per year which works out 467 million kgs. per month. Out of this, 10 million kgs. of yarn to be supplied by the Indian Cotton Mills Federation is for the handloom weavers working in the co-operatives and corporations only. These people constitute only 20 per cent of the total 40 lakhs of handlooms. Then what about the other 80 per cent of the handloom weavers? They have been left to their fate by this Government. Sir, in 1991-92, when 165 handloom weavers in Andhra Pradesh died of starvation, the Minister of Textiles promised on the floor of this House that the South India Mill Owners' Association would supply 4,000 bales of yarn per month at reasonable rates to be distributed to the handloom weavers of Andhra Pradesh. But, actually, they supplied 300 bales of yarn only and said that they would not be able to supply any more yarn because the cotton prices had gone up. And it is not known as to how much quantity the Indian Cotton Mills Federation is going to supply and within what period. This has to be clarified by the Minister..

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SYED SIBTEY RAZI): May I request you to conclude?

SHRI PRAGADA KOTAIAH: The most important thing, Sir, in that 166 million kgs. of yarn was exported in the last year. We have been repeatedly requesting the Government to ban the export of yarn. Apart from this, they are allowing all the export-oriented units to export as much yarn as possible. Yarn is being exported under the advanced licensing scheme as

[Shri Pragada Kotaiah]

well. When they are helping the mills by banning the exports of cotton and, in fact, are allowing import of cotton, why can't the Government ban the export of yarn at least till such time as the requirements of the handloom weavers are met? I do not know why the Government is act willing to ban the export of cotton yarn, atleast, temporarily to help the weavers. We have also been suggesting that a cess be levied on the exports of cotton yarn and cotton so that the proceeds could be utilised to stabilise the prices of yarn. That is also not being considered by our Government. Sir, the price of silk has been increasing in the last two years. Then the Government has permitted import of 20 metric tonnes of silk, free of import duty. If this is so, why is the Government not allowing the import of cotton yarn so as to help the handloom weavers? Similarly, the day before yesterday, the Minister of Agriculture was saying that they were going to import sugar. For whose benefit is it being done? It is only for the sake of the rich people. We, poor people, use only salt. It is only to help the rich people that the Government has permitted the import of sugar. Sir, how much they are spending for the rehabilitation of the textile labourers! They have provided Rs. 2,000 crore, for the rehabilitation of the textile labourers who have become jobless or were willing to go out of these mills. But why is it that the Government is not willing to spend even a single paise for the rehabilitation of the handloom weavers who are being displaced on account of the competition with the powerloom sector?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SYED SIBTEY RAZI): Would you please conclude?

SHRI PRAGADA KOTAIAH: I am concluding, Sir, We have been requesting the Ministry of Textiles in this regard. They had written to the Finance Ministry, some two years back, proposing that some amount should be released from out of the National Renewal Fund for the rehabilitation of the handloom weavers. But, so far, there has been no reply. I have also been repeatedly requesting the Government of India, particularly, the Finance Ministry, to collect the Excise duty on processed cloth. Sir, we are producing 18,701 million mts. of mill and powerloom cloth. While there is no Excise duty on grey fabrics, the processed mill and powerloom cloth is to be subjected to a minimum Excise duty of Rs. 1.25 per sq. mt. But how much are we getting? The collections by way of Excise duty should have been Rs. 2,338 crores but the actual collection is Rs. 993 crores only—on cotton fabrics, it is Rs. 153 crores; on fabrics man-made yarn, it comes to Rs. 450 crores and on fabrics man-made synthetic fibre, the excise duty collection comes to Rs. 390 crores. Why is it so? Where is the leakage? What concessions have you given to the processing units? Are these processing units are getting exemptions of different types? All these things are being misused. Ultimately, you are not getting anything. The handloom sector is being subjected to competition from the mills and powerloom sectors which are able to sell their cloth in the open market free of fiscal levies. I have been suggesting that a high-level committee should be appointed to look into this aspect. The Ministry of Textiles, at the instance of the Finance Ministry, has appointed an inter-Ministerial Committee and this Committee consists of top officials of the Ministry of Textiles, the Finance Ministry, Planning Commission and the NABARD. This Committee feels that due amounts are not being collected as some units are evading payment of Excise duty. A special committee might be constituted to go into this question and to plug the loopholes, not only for augmenting the revenues of the Government but also for helping the handloom weavers. They are facing serious competition from the mill and powerloom cloth which are being sold free of Excise duty. Therefore, Sir, I would request....

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SYED SIBTEY RAZI): Mr. Kotaiah, please conclude.

SHRI PRAGADA KOTAIAH: I am concluding in one minute..

Sir, we have been pointing out to the Government that there should be adequate Excise duty on cone yarn to pro-

tect the handloom weavers who are using hank yarn. We had submitted a proposal two years back, that is, on 19th of August, 1992. Sir, cone yarn is cheaper than the hank yarn. The Government has to consider that aspect also. Now as regards restructuring of the Excise duty, it has been said that any allied industry which purchases cone yarn shall be exempt from duty if they wish to convert it into hank yarn. This means that any person in powerloom sector can purchase cone yarn and give a declaration that he would convert that yarn into hank yarn. Then, what will be the fate of the handloom weavers? The Government is not considering this aspect. The cone yarn should be subject to heavy taxation. Then only, there will be a sort of protection to the handlooms. That is why the Government of India, from the beginning, has been levying taxes on cone yarn. Now, in your restructuring affair, you have allowed any industry to purchase cone yarn and convert it into hank yarn. Do not allow this. If that is allowed, ultimately, the handloom industry will be at a disadvantage, and the handloom industry will be killed by the powerlooms. Perhaps you have forgotten a fact and it is high time the Government of India realised that the powerlooms are responsible for the closure of many mills in the country. And they were not able to kill the handloom industry because of the inherent qualities and the advantages that the handlooms have. Therefore, Sir, do not waste your money in the modernisation of the NTC mills because, ultimately, the powerlooms which are not governed by the labour laws and the factory laws will automatically swallow the textile mills. And they have already done it. And why do you spend crores and crores of rupees on modernisation of the mills without knowing the actual reason for the closure of the mills? Therefore, Sir, you protect the handloom industry and the textile mills by ensuring that the powerlooms are governed by the factory laws and the labour laws. Then only the workers will have job security, then only the workers will work in hygeinic conditions. Then only they will have the provident fund and other gratuity and other facilities that are being enjoyed by the workers on powerlooms in the mill. Mr. Vice-Chairman the powerloom in a mill is a tiger in a cage, the powerloom outside the mill is to man-eater. Don't forget that. That you Sir.

SHRI CHIMANBHAI MEHTA (Gujarat): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I consider that the Budget has both positive and negative aspects. And one may not overemphasise one aspect at the cost of the other. I welcome the basic approach. Those who looked at the Budget as a growth-orienting Budget, have also welcomed certain aspects. The British Secretary of State said two days back that this Budget would set a golden era of economic development for India. The 'Guardian' also wrote in the same vein. And, of course, there are certain positive aspects which we can see in the Budget —the convertibility of trade account, further globalisation of the market, BOP reaching up to 14 billion dollars, reduction of corporate tax and income-tax, and growing exports.

Having said about this positive side, I will now come to the other side. The external aspects of the economy are taken care of while the internal aspects of the economy are really a worrysome fact because although they say that there is no additional burden in excise due to the new taxation proposals, that is really not true. Perhaps, there is a miscalculation. The textile industry have projected that a 600 per cent increase would occur because of the new taxation proposals on textiles whereas the Government claims that it is not so. The Government hts projected an income of Rs. 215 crores from the textiles sector by this new taxation but according to the industry, they are going to collect Rs. 1400 crores, There is a wide difference. Something seems to have gone wrong somewhere. The excise on powerlooms is only 5 per cent. Then they have added 6 per cent more by further excise in the first stage of processing, which is called sizing, and once again, this has been increased at the processing stage. That means, it has gone up to 23 per cent. This mistake in calculation has increased the burden by Rs. 900 crores. There is an overall in-

[Shri Chiman Bhai Mehta]

crease of Rs. 1400 crores. Kindly re-calculate and find out because you have projected to collect Rs. 215 crores. You may sit with the textile industry people and find out what is the correct amount and that should be adjusted if there is any mistake. That would be quite fair.

Then I come to cotton shortage. There is a problem. Government wants to export cotton but handloom weavers would not like and the textile mills would also not like it. They have requested for higher mixture, blending of artificial and natural cotton fibre because there is blending going on and if the mills and the handloom weavers prefer more blending of artificial and natural cotton fibre, then you give them more incentives. That will save some cotton which can be exported also and the handloom weavers would not suffer if you give them incentives by way of tax concessions. Then, there is the question of employment also. Kindly consider it from that angle. Those who criticise the Budget, do so from a different angle. Reduction in customs duty would tremendously harm our national economy. My point is, if you reduce the customs duty, imports would be more and the local industry would be hurt. But I have not been able to understand as yet as to why the foreign institutions are buying our shares and stocks. It is because they are getting a return of 15 to 16 per cent on our stocks and shares. This means that our industries are giving profits. Industries in the overseas developed countries are not giving that much profit. So, with the reduction in customs duty, there is likely to be intense competition with the local industry. Since they do not want a cut in their profits, they say that they are doomed, and my general perception about the cry that is being raised is that reduction in import duty is going to hurt the local industry. Then I would ask as to how are they able to make a huge profit of 15 to 16 per cent for the foreign investors who buy your shares? That is a contradiction and somebody has to explain it. But they are not able to explain. You know, Indian labour is the cheapest labour and they are asking for a level playing field. At the same time I know that our interest rates are higher. But we can have a balancing arrangement. As I said, the labour is very cheap in our country. We can always—if we do not indulge in profiteering—compete. We do not want to put in new technology. We do not want to modernise. But we know that banks and financial institutions are prepared to give money. Of course, in regard to the new orientation that is being sought to be injected into our industry, it takes some time; I can understand it. But I do not know whether the Finance Ministry has taken the views of every industry. There are many small-scale industries. I will give the example of plastics. They are manufacturing plastic more or less out of scrap. They are taxed at their being Where is the question of their being competitive with other industries? At least, I, myself, did not know about certain details in this regard. I came to know only from their memorandum which they submitted to me when I was in Gujarat recently. I think a proper exercise has not been done. When you are giving custom concessions, you should keep in mind the interests of the small—scale units which form a major segment of our economy and which employ a large number of people. They should not be hurt. I am not talking about the middle and big industrialists who are shouting about the competition and saying that they are going to suffer. Well, I do not subscribe to their theory. I would like to understand it.

Now, there is one important aspect relation to the small-scale industries. When the inspectors visit the factories, they resort to a lot of harassment. You have tried MODVAT. You want to expand the tax base. While you are trying to expand the tax base, if you cover the small-scale industries-below Rs. 30 lakhs, they are exempt—the inspectors would come into the picture. The new procedures they have adopted are really creating a scare among these people. Therefore, the point is whether you can think of a turnover-tax in respect of small-scale industries. Otherwise, the inspectors come into the picture. There is also some confusion

about the tax. Therefor, kindly look into it.

Then, Sir, there are 1,500 texturising units in Surat and Ahmedabad; they are closed In fact, there was no tax on this item during the last ten years. I would make a suggestion here by which you can increase your revenue. In the case of the filament yarn, for the first time, you have imposed *ad valorem* duty. It is not uniform. In the case of polyester filament yarn, it is 60 per cent. In the case of nylon filament yarn, it is 30 per cent. In the case of viscose filament yarn, it is 15 per cent. You should bring about uniformity in this. I say this because this sector is giving more than Rs. 2,000 crores to the Government; perhaps, Rs. 2,500 crores. Therefore, you should abolish the duty on texturisation. Then, you will be able to adjust the figures and you will be able to increase the revenue.

I am a little bit surprised why multinationals are being favoured in certain matters. There is some criticism. Sometimes, it does happen. At the same time, I do not subscribe to the theory that the Government is being sold out to multinationals. It is not correct.

Sir, the excise duty on cosmetics and toilet soaps has been brought down up to 20 per cent. On the other hand, in the case of detergent powder, which is used by the common people, you have brought it down by only 5 per cent. What is the rationale behind it? Laundry soap, which is costlier, is taxed at 10 per cent, while in respect of detergent powder—absolutely a common man's washing device—the tax is 30 per cent. This requires a relook.

Similarly, the small-scale units manufacturing insecticides are hurt by the excise duty. I do not want to go into the details.

In regard to the import duty reduction on gold, you have not taken care. You have not examined it. Even today 60 per cent of gold in India is coming through clandestine channels. Although you have increased your income by allowing import of gold, you have not taken into consideration the aspect of gold coming through clandestine channels.

When you are trying to globalise, try to learn from the administrative experience of the USA and other developed countries. They do not go to the small scale and other industries. They do not search or go and raid the industry immediately. If they have a doubt, they call the management to their offices and reconcile their accounts. If you do not devise such an intelligent system, you will only be causing harassment to small industrial units. I am sorry to use harsh language. Therefore, you should adopt a system by which you can call a person whom you are suspecting of evading tax, to your office, to the office of the Excise and Customs Collector, and then ask him to come with the books, ask him to explain; but going to the factory is really very embarrassing for them also.

Now I will come to the macro-economy. The interest burden calculated this year is Rs. 46,000 crores. it is unparalleled. The receipts calculated are Rs. 145,000 crores, while the amount of interest comes to Rs. 46,000 crores. It is really a huge amount. That means, you will have to give away more than 1/3 of the receipts by way of interest. So, the total receipts are Rs. 1,45,000 crores. The expenses are Rs. 152,000 crores. Revenue deficit is Rs. 33,000 crores. Really, it is very high. Fiscal deficit has gone up to Rs. 55,000 crores. It is more than 1/3rd of the total budget. I will call it total disorganisation' of the macro-economy. That is why I say that it is going to be a herculean task to control inflation.

I feel, I do not want to assert, that prices are going to increase. In this year when elections are coming in several States, it is for you to decide how much price rise you want to inflict on your

voters. This argument is perhaps in your favour also, but I am talking in terms of people. Ultimately, the prices will escalate to such an extent that nothing would be under your control.

Now the experts have calculated Government's assets, public sector capital outlays, advances they have given. They come to Rs. 355 lakh crores, but your liability is Rs. 532 lakh crores. In 1984-85 the Government's liabilities were higher by 7.6 per cent. Today, it has gone up to 44 per cent. Liabilities are more than our assets. So, where is the room for you to manage the affairs? This is happening because expenditure is mounting. Perhaps you have no control over expenditure. In such a situation, you should ask experts to review how the expenditure is going up. Why can't you control it? There were several Committees appointed for this purpose. What about the administrative expenditure, wasteful expenditure? Unless you control it in no way would you be able to control the situation. Last year also you were not able to control. There is one thing which my Leftist friends would not like to appreciate. Having got the experience of the public sector the world over, we have found some defects in it and are compelled to review our view about it. Nobody is against the public sector as a sector as such. We have invested Rs. 1,35,000 crores in the public sector. Hardly 2 per cent return they have been able to earn. Many of them are losing concerns. Therefore, I strongly recommend disinvestment of the public sector in a phased manner. We are borrowing money at 12 per cent rate of interest, but the public sector is earning just 2 per cent. What a bankrupt way of borrowing and investing in the economy! So kindly go fast to the required extent and disinvest so that the Government revenue is not burdened with the Budgetary support. You have to pay Rs. 46,000 crores as interest. Try to find out from the public sector how they can repay it.

This Government is inviting privatisation in certain sectors. It is also inviting foreign investment. There is, therefore, a criticism against the Government that this is nothing but to sell-out to has Western interests and to big people. People who clsticise the Government on this keep quite when it is a question of their State. They ask for more private investment and more of foreign investment. Why I am pointing this out is because I want you to be constructive and want you to find out how well we can solve the problem. There is no point in attacking at each other. When I say inflation is going to rise, I do think of the poor, but I do not say that to talk about poor is the monopoly of-one man. Outside, at the election meetings, you do say there is nothing wrong about it, but here in this House I must have a serious discussion on that point and the Government should take care that the negative points of the Budget which are very very serious are reviewed. The excise duty you have put on the small-scale sector, textile sector, plastics, insecticides, detergents and many other industries. These have to be re-examined. If you are imposing **ad valorem** duty on several items, why don't you do so on other items like cigaratte also? Why do you have a specific duty on luxury and injurious items? If you rationalise the duty structure, you will get Rs. 500 crores. You can sit with the experts and sort out this problem. Thank you very much.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY (Tamil Nadu): The authors of the Budget presented this year are very jubilant and happy because they have achieved what they wanted to achieve. God-fathers of this Budget are also very jubilant comfortably sitting in the buildings of the World Bank and the IMF. Dr. Manmohan Singh is a man of exemplary integrity and extraordinary economic brilliance. Nobody could doubt that. But he has because a prisoner of the atmosphere that has been created over the years. He and his colleagues continue to say that the present burden on the economy is the legacy of their pre-

decessor, the National Front Government, which ruled only for eleven This Budget of Dr. Manmohan Singh has opned the flood-gates of deficits. This deficit is an upprecedented one. The Finance Minister says it is to the tune of only Rs. 6,000 crores, but everybody knows it is more than even Rs. 10,000 crores. They have shown this figure of Rs. 6,000 crores because the Government is pinning all its hope for reducing the Budgetary deficit next year on a sharp industrial recovery aided by greater buoyancy in excise duty and lower tax evasion. So, they expect more returns by better tax administration. But this does not happen. Naturally, there will be Rs. 4,000 crores of loss due to the customs duty reductions, the reducion in the corporate tax. You cannot compensate that loss. Definitely it would be more than Rs. 10,000 crores' deficit. You have done it at the behest of the IMF and the World Bank. The foreigners and the multinationals have achieved what they demanded from you. This unprecedented deficit will push us further towards inflation. The inflation which is already heading towards the double digit, the spiralling inflation, will hike the prices of all the commodities. The common man, the man belonging to the middle class, who comes under the bracket of monthly salaried people and the daily wage-earners, is the most affected. In the month of June 1991. the party which is now occuping the Treasury benches here in Parliament, made bombastic promises that the prices would be brought down within 100 days Now, more or less 1,000 days have passed. If you say that this Government has brought down the prices, you will become a laughing stock. The prices have gone sky-rocketing. The man-in-the-street is not bothered about your explanation or definition you are, giving inside and outside the Parliament, as he is the worst-affected. His economic backbone has broken. I am pained to say that you have mortgaged the economic sovereignty of the country at the gates of the World Bank and the IMF. It is they who fanted you to reduce the customs duty; t is they who wanted you to reduce the corporate tax and income-tax; it is they who wanted you to reduce the direct taxes. Therefore, you have been driven to impose the indirect taxes in the manner which is directly hitting the consumers, the common man and the middle lass. Sir, the prices have already gone up. Inflation has almost reached 10 per cent. Since the time at my disposal is very short, I can't deal with these points elaborately. Sir, I crave your indulgence for some more minutes. But inflation is already 10 per cent Sir, the prices have already gone up and before the Budget, for what reasons has the Government increased the prices of petrol, desel and cooking gas? For what reasons have the prices of these items been increased? The prices of petrol and diesel have come down in other countries. The international prices have come down. There is no Gulf War. There is no compulsion from the oil countries. Then why has the Government increased the prices before the presentation of the Budget? I say, you were compelled by your masters. So, you wanted to reduce the deficit. Otherwise, the deficit would have been greater than what you have informed. (Time Bell.) I just now stated, Sir.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SYED SIBTEY RAZI): I am sorry. I told you in the very begining that you try to conclude within five or six minutes. Now, you have already taken seven minutes and you are saying that you have just started. There is a constaint of time. You please conclude within two minutes Mr. Samy, I can't allow the Members to speak like this. From your party, about eight Members are still left to speak. You have to be considerate to others also. Try to conclude within three minutes.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: Sir, kindly give me five minutes. Sir, the prices of onio, pottoes, tomatoes, wheat, rice and sugar have gone up. The price of one

kg. Nirma packet has come down. Now, it is costing Rs. 14.30, that is, 20 paisa less than the earlier price. But the excise levy imported by you on footwear has increased the price of footwear. So the customs duty has been increased by 15 per cent on footwears on account of the new increase in excise duty. The price of a pair of Hawai chappal has been increased from Rs. 35 to Rs. 45. It is not a luxury item today. The common man uses this footwear. A pair of leather chappal costs Rs. 125/- against the old price of Rs. 100. The steep increase in customs duty adversely affects the poor and the middle class people. It is feared that most of the manufacturing companies of Hawai chappals and leather chappals face closures of their manufacturing units in Tamil Nadu, Kerala, Delhi, Punjab, Kanpur and Agra. In this way, thousands and thousands of workers and the employees engaged in the chappal manufacturing business are likely to lose their jobs and livelihood. Sir, agriculture is producing two-fifth of the national income, but capital formation is down and down, as Dr. Mitra pointed out when he participated in the debate by three to four times over the last four years. So, public investment is less because expenditure in agriculture has been reduced. And fertilizer subsidy has also been reduced from Rs. 6,600 crores last year to Rs. 4,000 crores this year. It has also been dictated by the IMF and the World Bank. And the worst affected is the farmer, the peasant who is toiling from dawn to dusk by the sweat of his brows in order to produce for the country. But he is caught in the quagmire of debts, the quicksand of debates. There is no possibility of relieving him from this quagmire.

Sir, regarding the powerloom sector and the handloom sector, Mr. Kotaiah elaborated the position in detail and millions of weavers are the worst-affected in the handloom sector. Therefore, this Budget has given a rosy picture of the economy.

Sir, I would like to draw the attention of the House to one important point—may be, Members of Parliament will also be interested. The Government has made a statement regarding the M.Ps. Local Area Development Scheme. A Member of Parliament can make recommendations up to one crore of rupees' worth of projects. Sir, the people think that M.Ps. are given one crore of rupees! The common man thinks that an M.P gets one crore of rupees. But this amount of one crore of rupees is meant for developmental works. But there is no allocation from the Budget. I am opposed to the idea of this Local Are a Development Scheme. You are trampling upon the domain of the States. You are trampling upon the domain of the panchayats. You are encroaching upon the domain of the panchayats. This amount which has been marked for this year, you have taken from the amount which you have already given to the panchayats. So, it is the duty of the panchayats to select the projects, to clear the projects under the States. And whichever party occupies the throne, it should not encroach upon the domain of the States. So, I am opposed to this M.P. Local Area Development Scheme of one crore. ..(interruptions).. You have reduced the price of Nirma by 20 paise. I appreciate that.

Therefore, again, this Budget has been presented at the behest of the World Bank. Sir, Adam Smith's laissez-faire policies the Americans are not practising in their own country. Thirty per cent of the national income is controlled by the Government sector, but they have played havoc in the Scandinavian countries and the Latin American countries. They are doing the same mischief to the Government of India.

With these words, Sir, I conclude.

SHRI GOVINDRAO ADIK (Maharashtra): Thank you very much, Mr. Vice-Chairman. Sir, for giving me this opportunity to participate in the Budget discussion for 1994-95. Sir, this is my first speech in this august House and I request your goodself to give me sufficient time to speak. I do not know whether you are going to grant me sufficient time but looking to the constraint of time I shall try to be as brief as possible.

Sir, at the outset, I would like to congratulate the hon. Finance Minister for

having presented a Budget which gives a direction to our progress. For the last two days, Sir, the discussion has been going on in this august House. I have listened to some of the speeches very carefully and I must say that some of the speeches from both the sides were very educative, constructive and thought- provoking. But some of the speeches which we heard here during the last two days were politically motivated and aimed at criticizing the Government only. I don't object to any criticism from the Opposition Members on the Budget. But this criticism must be constructive and it must be in the interest of the nation.

When we talk about the Budget, the Budget is a document submitted to the Parliament by the hon. Finance Minister. It contains a lot of facts, figures and calculations. I don't look at the Budget from that point of view. I look at the Budget as a document which has a capacity to give direction, which has a capacity to forecast, which is capable of taking us to the road of prosperity and progress, which is capable of implementation. If we apply these criteria and look at the Budget, you, Sir, along with other hon. Members of this House will agree with me that the hon. Finance Minister needs to be complimented and congratulated for this document which has been presented to this House. It is providing a direction to the entire economy. According to me it is a vital thing, it is a very, very important thing and I find in this Budget that direction. The direction is very clear-cut and, therefore, this Budget has got to be complimented. The Budget should always depict the picture as to where we were yesterday, where we are today and where we are going to be tomorrow. If this picture is depicted properly, I think the purpose of the Budget is served. I don't want to go into the details; I don't want to give any illustrations to supplement my arguments here because all of us know that it is enough to say that this Budget has got all these qualities in it. The Budget has got a combination of two things. On the one hand, we find there is optimistic confidence with full of hopes and aspirations. This is the confidence of the Finance Minister. This is the confidence which has been shown by the Government. On the other hand, in the Budget we see that they are incurring certain risks. As has been rightly pointed out by some of our friends in this House, this Budget is or can be said to be a risky Budget at the same time. Just now some of our friends were talking about the deficit, particularly the senior Members of this House. When they were discussing very seriously they had shown their concern over this deficit. We certainly say that it is going to be a very risky factor as far as the Indian economy is concerned. I know the hon. Finance Minister would give a proper reply. I am not entitled to say anything on his behalf. But I don't know how this deficit is going to be met. It is very difficult to say. The Finance Minister has mentioned in his speech that this deficit can be met by increasing the industrial production and by large-scale exports of industrial and agricultural goods. I don't know whether it is going to happen or not, and To what extent I don't know. But I hope that whatever he has expected to come in the near future, would come, true.

Sir, I would like you to go a little behind. Sir, the circumstances under which this Budget is presented is also equally important. While considering, whether this Budget is good or bad, let us not forget under what circumstances the Finance Minister has framed the Budget proposals. We have got the experience of the last two yeasr.. We have seem in the last two years what circumstances this country was passing through. At that time, many people were worried and they were talking about the future of India. They were very much confused. People living outside India were also worried. Nobody knew what would happen. But the hon. Prime Minister and the Finance Minister showed enough courage to accept these challenges. They accepted the challenges on the economic front very boldly and courageously and came out openly with a reformist policy. Not only they came out with a reformist policy but they also implemented it vigorously and sincerely. As a result of it, now, we are seeing a change in the Indian economy. I don't want to quote any figures here. But it is a fact that the foreign exchange reserves were totally drained out at one pointing time. But somebody was saying that 50 per cent

[Shri Govindrao Adik]

of the foreign exchange reserve would go if certain foreign investors decide to take away their money. I have nothing to say about it. Even if 50 per cent of it goes then 50 per cent of it still would remain with us. According to me, that is also a commendable thing.

Sir, the foreign exchange position has improved. Secondly, the export position has also improved. I don't say that the prices are not rising at all. But you know how the prices were rising in the past. Now the prices are also controlled. The supply of essential goods to the common man in the country at reasonable prices is more than satisfactory. The production in the industrial sector and also in the agricultural sector is also very much satisfactory. The rate of inflation is also checked. So, looking to all these factors, one can say that the health of the Indian economy has definitely improved. It has improved and it is improving further. So, with this background the Finance Minister has presented this Budget. Sir, I don't want to advise the Finance Minister on certain issues. But looking to the time available to me, I take this opportunity to make certain suggestions to the Finance Minister. As far as the deficit financing is concerned, it is needless to say that the Government has to be very careful about it. The Government should take ev ery step to minimise this deficit. For that purpose if some machinery is requred to be set up I would request the hon. Finance Minister to do so. He should think over it more seriously. If need be, a separate machinery should be set up to monitor, supervise and control the situation. Secondly, we are emphasising more on exports. If we have to improve our export position, necessary infrastructural facilities will have to be made available to the exporters. We will have to provide better roads, rail-links, air cargo facilities, shipping facilities, electrocity etc. All these things need to be looked into. Unless we take care of these things. I don't think there will be any prospects for increasing our exports. There is another thing which I would like to bring to the notice of the hon. Minister We have now accepted the policy of inviting foreign investment in our country. In response to this policy of the Government of India, foreign investment is coming to India on a very big scale. Now the Government has allowed them to invest in India to the extent of 24 per cent of our share holdings. Previously, it was not 24 per cent. This time it has been increased to 24 per cent. I think this needs to be reviewed as this involves certain risks. Local entrepreneurship will be affected adversely. As far as my informations goes, no country in the world allow, for more than 10 per cent foreign investment. Here, we have crossed the limit. I request the hon. Finance Minister to reconsider this position. Sir, it has always been said that the backbone of Indian economy is its agriculture. When one looks at the Budget provisions, I must say very humbly that agriculture has been neglected this time. I request the hon. Minister to consider a few points regarding agriculture. First and foremost, is subsidy on fertilizers. Last year, the Budget provided for a subsidy of Rs. 4000 crores. This was increased subsequently by Rs. 1,000 crores, making it Rs. 5,000 crores. Last year, the subsidy provided on fertilizer was more than Rs. 5,000 crores. But this year it has been brought down to Rs. 4,000 crores. Now we are thinking of adopting new technology. We are importing new technology. We are allowing foreign investment in the agricultural sector. We are providing infrastructural facilities and we are also giving incentives to farmers. This all will lead to an increase in agricultural production. More land will be brought under cultivation. This is bound to result in more consumption of fertilizers. On the one hand we want to increase the yield of agricultural production. But at the same time we are cutting down the subsidy on fertilizers. So, this is not according to the policy of the Government. So, I request the hon. Minister to increase this subsidy portion from Rs. 4,000 crores to a minimum Rs. 8,000 crores as far as fertiliqers are concerned.

Secondly, regarding lending, unless we provide sufficient loans to the farmers in the country, nobody can cultivate his

land and nobody can produce more agricultural produce. But looking to the guidelines given by the Reserve Bank of India in the past, it was decided that 18 per cent of the total lending should go to the agricultural sector. But unfortunately, when we took a review, we came to the conclusion that even this 18 per cent is not loaned to the agricultural sector. Out of the total amount that was lent to different sectors, hardly 14 to 15 per cent was given to agriculture. I hereby make a request to the Finance Minister that if you want to have the agricultural sector improved and srengthened, this percentage of loaning must be increased simultaneously. Therefore, we request on behalf of the farming community that this amount should be a minimum of 20 per cent, and the guidelines must be given to the Reserve Bank of India and all the nationalised and scheduled banks in this regard.

Thirdly, Sir regarding the rate of interest, now the farmer is asked to have the loan facility at the commercial rate of interest. I think, by paying 13 per cent or 14 per cent or even 15 per cent rate of interest on crop loan, I don't think any farmer in this country can make his economy viable. So, unless we reduce the rate of interest for this farming community, we shall not be providing any incentives. Therefore, I request that this rate of interest should be brought down to 5 or 6 per cent and no more than that.

(THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY) in the Chair)

Now, I would like to insist upon one thing as far as agriculture is concerned. And that is regarding the crop insurance scheme. All of us live day-to-day the same life. Agriculture is the only industry—whatever you may call it profession or industry—it is the only sector which is at the mercy of vagaries of nature. Sometimes there are floods, sometimes there are droughts, sometimes there is some disease, sometimes there is some climatic change. And because of this, the farmer is always put at the mercy of nature. And many a time he loses his crop. He loses his crop because of the natural calamity. There are natural calamities as well as man-made calamities also. For example, I would mention one thing here about the man-made calamity. Last time, when there was a strike by surface transporters in India, it has been our experience that within a week's time within eight days' time the agricultural produce worth thousands and thousands of crores of rupees was lost. And that was loss to the farming community alone. The Government did not come forward to share this loss with the farmers. So, agricultural goods worth thousands and thousands of crores of rupees were destroyed. They were finished. But the farmer could not get any help out of it. So, unless the crops are insured, whether it is a natural calamity or a man-made calamity, unless we provide them an adequate insurance policy. I think, farming will not be a profitable proposition. I, therefore, request the Government of India to accept this general crop or composite insurance scheme for all the farmers.

Then, Sir regarding this credit system also, the farmer is always at the mercy of these bankers or the co-operative societies or the private money-lenders In

[Shri Govindrao Adik]

this connection, I would like to make a suggestion to the Government of India. As has been announced by the Government of Maharashtra recently, the Government of India should also implement the same policy throughout the country by providing credit cards to the farmers.

Unless this credit card system is accepted throughout India for all the farmers, the difficulties being faced by the farming community cannot be removed easily. The system of providing credit cards to the farmers can also be started in other areas initially for a period of 3 or 4 or 5 years and then we can see whether it works smoothly. I request the hon. Minister to consider this suggestion.

With regard to export of argriculture goods, recently a large area has been brought under horticulture in my State of Maharashtra and I am sure the same would be the position in other States as well. The difficulty that has arisen before the farmers is that though they are able to produce fruits and flowers, they do not know what to do with it because there is no local market for it. We have to create marketing facility for the farmers, otherwise just talking of progress or welfare of the farmers would look artificial. I request the Government of India, particularly the Ministry of Finance to prevail upon the Ministry of Agriculture to see that processing and marketing facilities are provided to the farming community throughout the country.

Lastly, we must compliment the Government of India for having accepted the policy last year and the year before, of providing a subsidy of 50 per cent for the drip irrigation system if it is acceptable to the farmers. Unfortunately, I am told, that this time this subsidy has been withdrawn. If it is so, I urge upon the Finance Minister to continue to provide this subsidy for the drip irrigation in the country. It is very essential to save water as much as possible. The Government can come forward with a helping hand to the farmers in the case of drip irrigation system because as it is, this is a very technical and a costly system and farmers are not in a position to bear the burden of drip irrigation system without this subsidy. This will not only save some water, it will also maximise our agricultural production.

I would appeal to all those who criticise the Finance Minister for this Budget to appreciate that it is after a long time that we see a smile on the face of an ordinary person. After a very long time we see a smile on his face and we see the signs of hope in the present atmosphere, and a spirit of confidence among the people. Let us not destroy this smile; let us not destroy those hopes. Let us try to encourage him by supporting the policy of reforms initiated by the Government of India under the leadership of the Prime Minister and the Finance Minister.

I conclude by quoting a few lines of a poet who has rightly said:

सदियां बीती हैं किस्मत आजमाने के लिए ।
क्या नहीं लगती मेहनत घर बसाने के लिए ।।
आज के दिन मनमोहन सिंह जी को हसने वालो, देख जरा ।
कितने दिन बीते हैं एक दिन मुस्कुराने के लिए ।।

धन्यवाद ।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY): Shri Viren J. Shah.

SHRI VIREN J. SHAH (Maharashtra): Sir, Shrimati Kamla Sinha wanted to speak. I do not mind giving the floor to her.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY): Who would like to speak first? According to the procedure, I have called Shri Viren J. Shah.

SHRI VIREN J. SHAH: I do not mind her speaking.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY): All right. Shrimati Kamla Sinha, you can speak now.

SHRIMATI KAMLA SINHA (Bihar): Sir, first of all, I would like to know how much time I could take.

SHRI VIREN J. SHAH: Five minutes.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY): How much time do you want to take, Madam?

SHRIMATI KAMLA SINHA: Forty minutes are left for my Party.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY): Thirty-five minutes are left. Therefore, please try to be very brief.

श्रीमती कमला सिन्हा (बिहार) : उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं आपके सामने वित्त मंत्री जी ने जो बजट पेश किया है, उसके बारे में कुछ बोलना चाहती हूं। वित्त मंत्री जी ने यह चौथा बजट पेश किया और जब पहला बजट उन्होंने पेश किया था जनता दल की सरकार के गिरने के बाद, जो उन्होंने एक प्रोप-अप सरकार को खड़ा किया था, उसके जाने के बाद जब पहला बजट पेश किया गया था तो बड़े फेन-फेयर के साथ उस बजट को पेश किया गया था। यह कहा गया था कि देश की आर्थिक हालत बहुत बिगड़ गई है, देश नाजुक हालत में है, हमारे पास खजाना खाली है, विदेशी कर्जा बहुत बढ़ गया है, देश बहुत बुरी हालत में है, देश दुर्दिन में है और इस हालत में हमारे पास कोई दूसरा रास्ता नहीं है सिवाय इसके कि हम एक नई आर्थिक और औद्योगिक नीति देश के सामने लाएं और देश को एक नई दिशा दें। नई दिशा उन्होंने दी और लिब्रलाइजेशन आफ इकॉनमी जिसको कहते हैं, साथ-साथ ग्लोबलाइजेशन आफ इकॉनमी, दुनिया के बाजार में हमें एक हो जाना चाहिए, हमारा बाजार खुल जाना चाहिए, हमारा दरवाजा खुल जाना चाहिए, यह सब कहा गया, हुआ और उस समय आम जनता को लगता था कि शायद कोई बहुत भारी बात बनने वाली है, लेकिन आज जब चौथा बजट आया तो उस समय हमें क्या देखने को मिलता है, क्या उपलब्धि हुई हमारी? आप अगर गौर करेंगे तो हालत क्या थी, हालत यह थी कि इन्द्र भगवान की कृपा से देश में बारिश अच्छी हुई और किसानों की मेहनत से खती अच्छी हुई। दुनिया के बाजार में हमें अनाज के लिए भीख मांगने नहीं जाना पड़ा, अपने देश में अनाज का काफी स्टाक था और हमारे पास उद्योग का जो इन्फ्रास्ट्रक्चर बना हुआ था, वह भी काम कर रहा था और धीरे-धीरे कुछ सालों में विदेशी मुद्रा भी कुछ इकट्ठी हो गई तो उन्होंने कहा कि हमारी हालत सुधर गई। लेकिन अगर आप देखें तो भारत की स्थिति पिछले दिनों में, आजादी के बाद से लेकर आज तक जो हालत थी, उसमें शायद सबसे गिरी हुई हालत में हम आज हैं। गरीबी इतनी बढ़ गई है, जिसका कोई हिसाब नहीं। आज के दिन में लगभग तीन-साढ़े तीन करोड़ नौजवान बेकार सड़क पर खड़े हैं, जिनके पास कोई काम-काज नहीं है और अगर श्रम मंत्रालय के आंकड़ों पर हम विश्वास करें तो इस सदी के अंत तक 10 करोड़ नौजवान और काम के बाजार में आएंगे, लेकिन रोजी-रोजगार का कोई इंतजाम हो नहीं पाएगा। गरीबी बढ़ती जा रही है, गरीबी की रेखा से नीचे लोग जाते जा रहे हैं और हमारा जो विकास का इन्फ्रास्ट्रक्चर है, वह चरमरा रहा है, यह हालत है। इसी पृष्ठभूमि में माननीय वित्त मंत्री जी को चौथा बजट पेश करने का सौभाग्य प्राप्त हुआ और जो बजट उन्होंने पेश किया, अगर यह कहें कि यह बजट देश के धनी लोगों, मध्यम वित्त लोगों और पूंजीपतियों का बजट है, यह हिन्दुस्तान की आम जनता का बजट नहीं है तो कोई गलत कहना नहीं होगा। महोदया, इस बजट का फल हमारे देश की 70 फीसदी जनता को नहीं छू पाएगा। यह बजट एक घाटे का बजट है। घाटे के बजट का मतलब क्या होता है? देश में तो पैसा चाहिए ही, नोट तो छापे जाएंगे ही, लेकिन नोट की कीमत घट जाएगी, इंफलेशन बढ़ेगा। इस बजट की एक और खूबी है कि यह बजट एक डेफिसिट

[श्री मती कमला सिन्हा]

बजट है। इसके कारण इंफलेशन बढ़ेगा, मुद्रा स्फीति होगी और डबल डिजिट में जाने वाली है। वह बजट फिस्कल डेफिसिट है। यह 54915 का फिस्कल बजट है, डेफिसिट बजट है और इसका मतलब है कि यह 6 प्रतिशत जी.डी.पी. है। अगर देखा जाए कि रेवेन्यू लॉस भी हो रहा है। चूंकि बड़े लोगों को जो कर में छूट दी गई, जो टैक्स कंसेशन दिए गए, उसके कारण रेवेन्यू लॉस भी होगा और रेवेन्यू डेफिसिट भी है। यह रेवेन्यू डेफिसिट का बजट है और इसमें 3604 करोड़ रुपए का रेवेन्यू डफिसिट का है, जिसमें वह टैक्स कंसेशन के कारण ही हुआ है। वित्त मंत्री जी ने कहा कि टैक्स कम कर दिया, इसके कारण हमारे घर में टैक्स और ज्यादा आएगा, लोग जल्दी-जल्दी टैक्स पे करेंगे, अपना टैक्स तो चुकाएंगे। लेकिन पिछले तीन साल का जो अनुभव हुआ है उसमें यह देखा गया है कि हम टैक्स कम करते गए, लेकिन हमारे रेवेन्यू में वृद्धि नहीं हुई, टैक्स का इजाफा नहीं हुआ, लोगों ने टैक्स नहीं दिया। महोदय, इन्होंने इससे पहले क्या किया था? पब्लिक अंडरटेकिंग्स के चार हजार करोड़ रुपए के शेयर्स बेचे जा चुके थे। उसको कहा जा रहा है कि यह इसमें हैं। यह गलत बात है, इसमें गिनती नहीं करनी चाहिए। महोदय, इस प्लान को, इस बजट को अगर ठीक से देखा जाए तो आप देखेंगे कि हमारे प्लान एक्सपेंडिचर में भी गिरावट आई है, कमी हुई है। पिछले दिनों जो प्लान एक्सपेंडिचर था उससे इस बजट में पिछले दिनों 93–94 में 46 हजार 26 करोड़ का था और इसमें 46 हजार 582 का ही है, यानी एकदम मार्जनल इंक्रीज है। इससे तो काम नहीं बनेगा। इसका जो दूसरा नतीजा होगा वह यह कि प्रांतों में और यूनियन टेरिटॉरिज का बजटरी सपोर्ट घटेगा। यह करीब-करीब 8 प्रतिशत घटेगा। तो यह बहुत गलत बात हो रही है। इस बजट में जो गलत बात है, वह यह है कि वित्त मंत्री जी ने यह कहा कि कैपिटल गुड्स को हम सस्ता करेंगे और इंपोर्ट ड्यूटी को हम कम करेंगे, टैक्स कंसेशन देंगे। तो फिर हमारे यहां जो पूंजीपति हैं वह ज्यादा पूंजी लगाएंगे, हमारे विकास की दर बढ़ेगी और इसमें मुद्रा का समायोजन होगा। लेकिन यह बात सही नहीं निकली। वित्त मंत्री जी के एकोनोमिक सर्वे को ही आप देखें तो आप यह देखेंगे कि हमारे देश में प्राईवेट इंवेस्टमेंट बढ़ी नहीं है और न ही विदेशी इंवेस्टमेंट उतना बढ़ा है, क्योंकि प्राईवेट इंवस्टमेंट बढ़ने के लिए जो इंफ्रा-स्ट्रक्चर्ल सपोर्ट चाहिए वह यहां उतना नहीं है, क्योंकि उसके लिए डोमेस्टिक मार्केट में डिमांड का बढ़ना चाहिए, लोगों की क्रय-शक्ति बढ़नी चाहिए और अपने घरेलू बाजार भी बढ़ना चाहिए। लेकिन ऐसा इस देश में हुआ नहीं है।

हमने इंपोर्ट ड्यटी को कम कर दिया, बहुत भारी कम किया। केपिटल गुड्स को मंगाने के लिए, यह कहा गया कि इसके कारण हमको इंपोर्ट बढ़ाने से अपने यहां पर ज्यादा लोग अपना केपिटल गुड्स के निर्माण के लिए ज्यादा इंपोर्ट करेंगे और इस इंपोर्ट के कारण हमारे यहां नेट एडिशनल रेवेन्यू लगभग 27 सौ करोड़ रुपए हो जाएगा। लेकिन अगर पिछले तीन साल के आंकड़ों को वित्त मंत्री जी स्वयं देखें तो वह खुद देखेंगे कि उनका यह मानना गलत है। लेकिन इसका एक मतलब होगा कि अपने देश में जो इंडस्ट्रिलाइजेशन प्रोसस है उसमें भी कमी आएगी, अपने देश के उद्योगों में गिरावट होगी, अपने देश के औद्योगिकरण में बाधा बनेगा महोदय। तो एक तो भारी गलत काम हुआ है कि जब बजट सत्र बैठने ही वाला था उसके ठीक पहले प्री बजट प्राइस हाइक कर दिया गया और उस में अनाज का दाम, पी.डी.एस. में चीनी, चावल और अन्य सामग्री के दाम बढ़ा दिए गए। एल.पी.जी. का दाम बढ़ाया गया, डीज़ल का बढ़ाया, पेट्रोल का बढ़ाया और इससे 4000 करोड़ रुपया इन्होंने कमा लिया। प्री बजट में रेलवे फ्रेट और चार्ज बढ़ाकर 1000 करोड़ रुपया कमाया। फूड सबसिडी को काट कर 1200 करोड़ रुपया कमा लिया। तो इस से नुकसान किसका हुआ? इस से नुकसान आम

जनता का हुआ। साधारण जनता, साधारण उपभोक्ताओं को यह नुकसान हुआ क्योंकि पब्लिक डिस्ट्रीब्यूशन सिस्टम से सामान खरीदने के लिए वही लोग जाते हैं। बड़े लोग वहां से नहीं खरीदते हैं। आम जनता वहां जाएगी जिसकी आमदनी कम है। उन के ऊपर आप ने चोट की।

श्रीमन, थर्ड क्लास का रेल किराया बढ़ाया जिस के कारण साधारण लोग, कम आमदनी वाले लोगों पर आपने चोट की। फूड सबसिडी को काटकर आपने जो 1200 करोड़ रुपया कमाया, वह भी साधारण लोगों के ऊपर चोट की। यह मुनाफा, यह इजाफा आप ने किस को दिया? जो ऊंची आमदनी वाले लोग हैं जो अपर मिडिल क्लास के लोग हैं, जो मिडिल क्लास के लोग हैं और जो पूंजीपति हैं उन को तथा जो मल्टीनेशनल कंपनियों को आप ने बुलाया उन को इस का फायदा दिया। इससे बड़ा भारी खतरा उत्पन्न होगा। वित्त मंत्री जी अपने देश के अंदर एक अत्यंत खतरे की स्थिति और पैदा की है जिस से प्रान्तों के ऊपर भी बोझ पड़ेगा। एक तो बजटरी सपोर्ट आपने कम कर दी। इससे प्रान्तों का रेवेन्यू घट जाएगा, उनके खर्चे बढ़ जाएंगे और उनको टैक्स कंसेशन के कारण उनको रेवेन्यू स्वीज़ हो जाएगा सेंट्रल बजटरी सपोर्ट नहीं रहने के कारण ऐब्सलूट टर्म्स में उन की आमदनी में बहुत ही गिरावट आएगी। यह प्रान्तों के विकास में भी बड़ी भारी बाधक होगी।

महोदय, वित्त मंत्री जी ने अपने बजट में बड़ी उम्मीदें की कि हमारे यहां औद्योगिक विकास न होने से हम आगे विकास नहीं कर पाएंगे। औद्योगिक विकास के लिए इन्होंने विदेशी पूंजीपतियों के लिए दरवाजा खोला और ग्लोबलाइजेशन आफ इकानामी, मार्केट इकानामी को बढ़ावा देने का प्रयास किया। लेकिन मैं इन्हीं के इकानामिक सर्वे आफ इंडिया, 1993-94 की ओर इनका ध्यान दिलाना चाहती हूं जो 27 फरवरी को पेश हुई है। उसमें लिखा हुआ है कि फारेन इनवैस्टमेंट इनक्रीज 585 मिलियन जो था फर्स्ट क्वार्टर में 3.5 बिलियन था लेकिन सचमुच में यह वृद्धि 850 मिलियन केवल डाइरेक्ट इंवैस्टमेंट में हुई है। बाकी कहां गया। बाकी हमारे भारत के जो घराने हैं उनके शेयर खरीदने में लगा। यानि विदेशी पूंजीपति हमारे यहां अपनी पूंजी, अपनी टैक्नालॉजी ट्रांसफर करना नहीं चाहते हैं, न ही ये यहां पर ऐम्प्लायमेंट जेनरेट करना चाहते हैं, लेकिन ये यहां पर स्थापित जो पूंजी है, जो अच्छा काम कर रहा हैं, जो अच्छा काम करने वाले कारखाने चालू हालत में हैं उनमें शेयर खरीदेंगे और उनके मालिक बन बैठना चाहते हैं। यह बहुत ही खतरनाक बात है। उद्योग मंत्री ने स्वयं अपने बयान में कहा कि अगर 6 से 8 प्रतिशत का औद्योगिक विकास, आर्थिक विकास नहीं हुआ तो उनकी उम्मीद है तो एक बहुत ही खतरनाक समस्या हमारे सामने आगे आने वाली है। मेरी तो दुआ होगी कि ऐसी खतरनाक समस्या उनको देखनी न पड़े लेकिन देश के लिए एक व्यक्ति की कोई कीमत नहीं होती है, लेकिन उसकी सजा पूरे देश को भुगतनी पड़ेगी। जिस ढंग से उन्होंने आर्थिक नीति को बनाना शुरू किया है उसका नतीजा देश को भुगतना पड़ेगा। यह देश पीछे चला जायेगा और पीछे जा भी रहा है। मैं एक-दो बात और आपके सामने कहना चाहूंगी। किसी भी देश के विकास के लिए जो इन्फ्रास्ट्रक्चर डवलपमेंट होना चाहिए वह हमारे देश में नहीं है। इसमें जो सेन्ट्रल प्लान आउटले किया उसको देखेंगे तो एनर्जी के लिए थोड़ा बहुत किया गया है लेकिन इरीगेशन और फ्लड कंट्रोल के लिए कुछ नहीं कहा। मेरे से पहले एक वक्ता बोल रहे थे, जाधव जी भी बोल रहे थे उन्होंने भी इस बात को कहा। आज हिन्दुस्तान को आजाद हुए 45 वर्ष से ऊपर हो गये। जो भी हमारे देश में पूरी कृषि योग्य जमीन है आज भी पूरी जमीन का सिंचित अश एक बटा पांच हिस्सा ही है। हम अभी तक उसमें सिंचाई बढ़ा नहीं पाये। अगर इसमें

[श्री मती कमला सिन्हा]

सिंचाई बढ़ा नहीं पायेंगे, सिंचाई की व्यवस्था कर नहीं पायेंगे तो फिर काम आगे बढ़ेगा नहीं क्योंकि कृषि और सिंचाई दोनों एक दूसरे पर निर्भर हैं।

ग्रामीण विकास के बारे में वित्त मंत्री जी ने कहा और कुछ पैसा भी रखा। जवाहर रोजगार योजना, प्रधान मंत्री योजना, इन्दिरा योजना वगैरह के लिए पैसा रखा। लेकिन जितना पैसा इसमें चाहिए था उतना नहीं है इसमें। और इससे कोई भी काम विकास का होगा ऐसा मुझे लगता नहीं है। दूसरी तरफ जो नौकरी करने वाले लोग हैं, इसमें आप पब्लिक अंडरटेकिंग्ज को लें या सरकारी उद्योगों में जो लोग काम करते हैं उनको लें, उनमें जो काम करने वाले श्रमिक लोग हैं यह सब आपने उनको नौकरी से निकालने के लिए किया, उनको सड़कों पर भेजने के लिए योजना जरूर बनाई है। इस योजना की मद में 320 करोड़ रुपये रखे–नेशनल रिहैबिलिटेशन फंड। पहले इसमें एक हजार करोड़ था अब उसमें इन्होंने 320 करोड़ रुपये जोड़ा। पहले साल जो इन्होंने अपना बजट पेश किया था उस समय कहा था एक्जिट पालिसी हम कर रहे हैं इसलिए कि हम लोगों को एकदम निकालेंगे नहीं। लेकिन जिनको नौकरी नहीं मिलेगी, जिन्हें मजबूरन नौकरी से बाहर जाना पड़ेगा उनके लिए हम रिट्रेनिंग, रिएम्पलायमेंट का काम करेंगे। इसी सत्र में इसी सदन में उद्योग मंत्री ने कहा था जब पब्लिक सेक्टर अंडरटेकिंग पर मेरा प्रश्न था। मंत्री महोदय ने जवाब दिया था कि अभी तक वह कार्यक्रम हम लोगों ने अपनाया नहीं। जिस कार्यक्रम को अभी तक अपनाया नहीं गया उसमें 320 करोड़ रुपये रखने का क्या मतलब है। वालियंटरी रिटायरमेंट देकर सड़क पर भेजने की जो बात है यह बहुत गलत है। (व्यवधान) मैं इंफ्रास्ट्रक्चर के बारे में कह रही थी। वित्त मंत्री जी ने अपने भाषण में एक जगह कहा है कि पावर जनरेशन हमारे देश में कम है। ऊर्जा हमारे देश में कम है और ऊर्जा को बढ़ाने के लिए अलग-अलग प्रांतों के जो बिजली सप्लाई करने वाले स्टेट इलेक्ट्रीसिटी बोर्ड्स हैं उनकी हालत को सुधारने के लिए हमने एक कमीशन बहाल किया है। वह उसकी देखभाल करेगा, उसके लिए सुझाव देगा। लेकिन सबसे बड़ी बात यह है कि पावर जनरेशन के जो तरीके हैं जो साधन हैं यह क्या केन्द्रीय सरकार उपलब्ध करा रही है प्रांतों को, एन.टी.पी.सी. को सशक्त कर रही है? जहां तक मेरी जानकारी है एन.टी.पी.सी. को वह सशक्त नहीं कर रही है। केन्द्रीय सरकार को जो प्रान्तीय सरकारों को इन्फ्रास्ट्रेक्चरल सेक्टर उपलब्ध कराने चाहिए वह नहीं कर रही है। मैं बिहार से आती हूं तो हमारे बिहार में जो कुछ उद्योग के प्रस्ताव लम्बित थे, जैसे कोयला कोर परियोजना, पहलगांव की योजना वे आज भी ऐसी की ऐसी बीमार पड़ी हैं। कई साल से इनकी फाइलों में बंद पड़ी है। मैं पूछना चाहती हूं ऐसा क्यों है? यह क्यों हो रहा है? जब तक विकास के लिए पावर नहीं होगा यह देश विकास नहीं कर पायेगा। ऊर्जा नहीं होगी तो कलकारखाने नहीं चलेंगे। वित्त मंत्री जी चाहे जितना भी भाषण दे लें, चाहे जितने मल्टी नेशनल बुला लें, वह कुछ नहीं कर पायेंगे जब तक यहां पर पावर नहीं होगी, इन्फ्रास्ट्रक्चर नहीं बनेगा। कोल के बारे में उन्होंने कहा कि हम माडर्नाइजेशन करेंगे कोल इंडस्ट्री में। दूसरी तरफ कोयला मंत्रालय की ओर से यह कहा जाता है कि कोयला विभाग बहुत ही विकसित है। हम विदेशों से टेक्नोलोजी मंगा रहे है। टेक्नीकल नो-हाऊ मंगवा रहे हैं। आस्ट्रिया से आ रही है, जर्मनी से आ रही है, इंग्लैंड से आ रही है, चीन से आ रही है। और तो और, हम उनको अंडरग्राऊंड माइनिंग की टेक्नीक सिखायेंगे और वे हम को ओवर-ग्राऊंड माइनिंग की टेक्नोलोजी सिखायेंगे। हम उनको टेक्नोलोजी सिखाने जाएंगे। इसके लिए कोयला मंत्री से ले कर कोल इंडिया के बहुत सारे अधिकारी जा रहे हैं और इस खर्च का भार वित्त मंत्री के ऊपर आ रहा है। लेकिन इसका नतीजा क्या

हो रहा है? पिछले 6 महीनों में चार बड़ी दुर्घटनाएं हो चुकी हैं। मेघालय में हुई, बंगाल में हुई और अभी मध्य प्रदेश में हुई। यह क्या साबित करता है? अगर सचमुच में कोयला विभाग ठीक ढंग से काम कर रहा होता तो यह एक्सीडेंट नहीं होते। दूसरी बात मैं यह कहना चाहूंगी कि हमारे देश में बहुत बेहतरीन कोयला मिलता है। इस कोयले में कोई कमी नहीं है। हमारे बिहार में भी तीन कोयला कम्पनियां हैं। सी०सी०एल० ई० सी० एल० और बी०सी०सी०एल० है। यहां फर्स्ट क्लास कोकिंग कोल निकाला जाता है। अपने यहां के कोयले को ठीक ढंग से नहीं निकाल कर विदेश से कोयला मगाने का क्या तुक है? जिस तरह से आज दिग्विजय सिंह जी बोल रहे थे कि रांची का एच.ई०सी० जिसके बारे में जवाहर लाल नेहरू ने कहा था this will be the mother of all the big industries in the country.

इसको जिस तरह से भारत सरकार ने अपनी नीति के तहत मार डाला है, उसी तरह से कोयला उद्योग को भी भारत सरकार अपनी नीति के तहत मारना चाहती है। इसीलिए हम विदेश से कोयला और लोहा आयात कर रहे हैं। हम कोयले और इस्पात का निर्यात कर सकते हैं, विदेशों में भेज सकते हैं लेकिन हम आज यहां आयात कर रहे हैं। यह बहुत ही गलत बात है।

उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, वित्त मंत्री द्वारा जो बजट प्रस्तुत किया गया है, इस बजट से एक तरफ गरीबी बढ़ेगी, बढ़ रही है और दूसरी तरफ धनी लोग और धनी होंगे। विदेशी पूंजीपतियों को इस देश में आने के लिए आपने दावत दी है। अभी तक उनको जिस ढंग से आना चाहिये था, वह आए नहीं लेकिन अगर आए तो वह हिन्दुस्तान के व्यापारिक और औद्योगिक बढ़ावे के लिए नहीं आएंगे, अपने पैसे के लिए आएंगे। क्योंकि

India provides the cheapest of labour.

वह चीप लेबर के एक्सप्लायटेशन के लिए आएंगे न कि वह हिन्दुस्तान के विकास के लिए आएंगे। दो सौ साल हम अंग्रेजों के गुलाम रहे। वह भी व्यापारी बन कर आए थे और हमारे मालिक बन बैठे थे। आज हम उन लोगों को कैसे-कैसे बढ़ावा दे रहे हैं और आप किस-किस के हाथ हिन्दुस्तान को बेचने की साजिश कर रहे हैं। मैं कहना चाहती हूं हिन्दुस्तान के नागरिक इसको कतई बर्दाश्त नहीं करेंगे। हम दोबारा उनकी गुलामी कभी कबूल नहीं कर सकते हैं। हम कतई नहीं स्वीकार करेंगे, यह मैं आपको आगाह कर देना चाहती हूं।

उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, अब मैं दो तीन बातें और कहूंगी। एक तो जब आर्थिक स्थिति बिगड़ती है तो समाज में कई चीजें बिगड़ जाती हैं। ला एंड आर्डर की हालत बिगड़ जाती है। समाज में मूल्य में गिरावट आती है। आम लोगों की रूचि, रियेक्शन जो होते हैं, सोशल नार्म्स और वेल्यूज़ सब में परिवर्तन आता है। वही आज हम को देखने को मिल रहा है। आप देखेंगे कि नयी आर्थिक नीति, नयी औद्योगिक नीति के आने के बाद इस देश में मूल्यों में इतनी गिरावट आई है। मैं चीज़ों की कीमतों के बारे में नहीं कह रही हूं, मेरे कहने का मतलब यह है कि वेल्यूज़ में इतनी गिरावट आई है, इसका क्या कारण है। आपने टेलीविज़न सस्ता कर दिया, आपने कास्मेटिक्स को सस्ता कर दिया, आपने कंज्यूमर गड्ज़ को सस्ता किया, आप इस देश में कंज्यूमरिज्म को चलाना चाहते हैं। आप इस देश में उपभोक्ता संस्कृति लागू करना चाहते हैं और उस उपभोक्ता संस्कृति को लागू करने का नतीजा है कि इस देश में इतनी गिरावट मूल्यों में आई है कि आये दिन हर रोज देखने को मिलता है औरतों के ऊपर अत्याचार atrocities against women and atrocities against the Dalits are on the rise. कभी भी इतिहास में इतना ज्यादा नहीं था जितना कि आज के दिनों में हो रहा है। इसका मतलब क्या है। इसका मतलब है मानसिक विकृति। वित्त मंत्री

[श्री मती कमला सिन्हा]

जी आप यकीन मानिये अगर आपका बजट वैल्यूज के तहत होता, राष्ट्रपिता महात्मा गांधी के रास्ते पर चला होता, आदर्श के तहत चला होता तो यह गिरावट नहीं आती। यह मूल्यों में गिरावट कतई नहीं आती। इतना जो औरतों के ऊपर, बच्चों के ऊपर अत्याचार हो रहा है, अन्याय हो रहा है, शोषण हो रहा है, शारीरिक और यौन, यह कतई नहीं होता। नौजवानों के हाथ में काम अगर होता तो वे ये काम नहीं करते। समाज में गिरावट नहीं आती। उपभोक्ता संस्कृति को आपने जन्म दिया है। इसका बड़ा भारी दुष्परिणाम इस देश को भुगतना पड़ेगा। इससे आप इंकार नहीं कर सकते।

मैं बिहार से आती हूं। मैं एक-दो बातें अपने प्रांत के बारे में कहना चाहूंगी। हमारे बिहार और पूर्वांचल के जो प्रांत है, भारत सरकार हमेशा इन प्रातों के बारे में उदासीन रही है। कभी भी समता के रास्ते में समता के साथ उनको तोला नहीं गया, देखा नहीं गया। शोषण जरूर किया गया है। बिहार अपनी खनिज संपदा देश के विकास के लिये देता रहा लेकिन उसके बदले जो कुछ चाहिये बिहार को वह नहीं दिया गया। बिहार के गरीब, गरीब किसान, गरीब मजदूर अपनी गाढ़ी कमाई का पैसा बैंकों में जमा करता है, फिक्स डिपाजिट करता है और उस फिक्स डिपाजिट के प्रत्येक रुपये का 65-70 पैसा भारत के विकास पर खर्च होता है पर बिहार में विकास में खर्च नहीं होता है। तो यह अन्याय बहुत दिन तक नहीं चलेगा।

हम एक सीमावर्ती प्रांत है। हमारी सीमा में हिमाचल और नेपाल हैं और भारत की जितनी प्रमुख नदियां हैं उनमें से कई प्रमुख नदियां नेपाल से आती हैं और साइक्लिक रेट से एकदम साल, दो साल या तीन साल में हम नियमित रूप से भंयकर बाढ़ के शिकार होते हैं। बाढ़ के प्रकोप में उत्तरी बिहार बहता है तो सूखाड़ के प्रकोप में दक्षिणी बिहार यह बिहार की नियति बन गयी है। लेकिन इस नियति से छुटकारा पाने के लिये अब तक भारत सरकार ने कुछ भी नहीं किया है। बारम्बार इस में कहा गया है। मैंने भी महोदय, एक बार एक प्रस्ताव के जरिये कहा था कि भारत के उत्तर में जो नदियां बहती हैं खास करके हिमाचल से आने वाली नदियां, हमारी उत्तरी सीमा के उस पार का जो देश है नेपाल वहां से आती हैं, उसके साथ बातचीत करें और फिर उन नदियों को बांधने का उपाय करें ताकि पन बिजली उत्पन्न हो, विकास का काम हो और हम बाढ़ से बच सकें। आज तक भारत सरकार ने उस दिशा में कोई काम नहीं किया। बारम्बार कहा गया है कि हम ज्वाइंट वाटर कमीशन बनायेंगे और कुछ करेंगे लेकिन अभी तक कुछ नहीं किया गया है। और तो और ऐसा लगता है कि बिहार को पिछड़ा रखना भारत सरकार का पहला एजेंडा बन गया है।

मैंने पिछले कई वर्षों से यह देखा है कि जिन राज्यों में कांग्रेस की सरकार नहीं है वहां पर तरह-तरह की मुश्किलातें खड़ी की गयी है। यह काम पंजाब में हुआ, यह काम कश्मीर में हुआ, यह काम बंगाल में हुआ, यह काम आसाम में हुआ। यह काम बिहार में भी ये लोग करा रहे हैं। उसके नतीजे सामने आये हैं। पंजाब में क्या हुआ था। हम जानते हैं कि पंजाब में क्या हुआ। काश्मीर में आज भी हम भुगत रहे हैं, उस पालिसी का नतीजा आज भी हम काश्मीर में भुगत रहे हैं। सारी दुनिया के सामने आज हम कठघरे में खड़े हैं और बंगाल में गोरखा आंदोलन चलवाकर वहां की सरकार को कमजोर करने की कोशिश की गयी। ज्योति बसु होशियार हैं, सकुशल प्रशासक हैं उन्होंने उसको संभाल लिया। बिहार में आपने झारखंड आंदोलन शुरू किया। आपके लोग, कांग्रेस के नेता उसको शह दे रहे हैं और यह कह रहे हैं कि बिहार के टुकड़े कर देने चाहिये। मैं यह कहना चाहती हूं कि हम इसे मानते हैं कि छोटे-छोटे राज्य बनने चाहिये, विकास के लिये वह अच्छा है। लेकिन स्टेट री-आर्गनाइजेशन कमीशन को बठाइयें

और उसमें विचार कीजिये । आबादी के हिसाब से बांटिये । बिहार में आदिवासियों की संख्या 27 प्रतिशत है । हमारी सरकार ने आदिवासी विकास परिषद का गठन किया है, आप उसका समर्थन कीजिये और आदिवासियों के विकास के लिये अगर आपकी सचमुच में रुचि है तो साधन मुहैया कराइये ताकि उनका विकास हो सके । लेकिन आग में घी डालने का काम मत कीजिये । देश ऐसे ही जल रहा है और अगर यह नीयत, यह काम आपका जारी रहा तो फिर यकीन मानिये भारतवर्ष की दुर्दशा हो करके रहगी और हम दुनिया के बाजार में भिखमंगों की कतार में तो होंगे ही साथ-साथ हमारा देश भी टुकड़े-टुकड़े हो जाएगा । महोदय, अभी भी चेतने का समय है । भारतवासी यह कतई नहीं चाहते हैं । आप सही रास्ते में चलेंगे, हम लोग आप का समर्थन करेंगे लेकिन आप गलत नीति अपनायेंगे तो निश्चित मानिये, वित्त मंत्री जी आप सज्जन व्यक्ति हैं, काश आपको अपना बचपन याद हो, काश आपको याद होता यह बजट पेश करने से पहले अपना बचपन, अपनी गरीबी, अपनी परेशानी तो शायद यह बजट आप हमारे सामने नहीं लाते । यह आपने नहीं किया...(व्यवधान) यह काम आपने नहीं किया । आप भूल गये अपने बचपन को, अपनी परेशानी को, अपनी पढ़ाई-लिखाई के जमाने की परेशानी को, आपको याद है जब आप सफल हुये उस समय से लेकर आज तक की बात आपको याद है । आप याद कीजिये उस समय को भी क्योंकि आधे से ज्यादा हिन्दुस्तानी आज भी उसी हालात में हैं और उनको ऊपर उठाने का काम कीजिये । जहां तक आप पहुंचे हैं, आप कोशिश कीजिये, हर हिन्दुस्तानी वहां तक पहुंचे तब मैं मानूंगी कि आप एक सफल वित्त मंत्री हैं, नहीं तो फिर आपकी यह अकर्मण्यता सारे देश के माथे पर एक कलंक बनकर रहेगी और हम भी आपके साथ भुगतेंगे ।

महोदय, आपने मुझे समय दिया, धन्यवाद ।

SHRI VIREN J. SHAH: Mr. Vice-Chairman, I start from where my predecessor has ended up. Recounting the qualities and stature of the hon. Finance Minister and also what Mr. Gopalsamy said about his integrity and respect, I personally knew him in 1967 when I was in the Fourth Lok Sabha and in the seventies when he was an officer in the Finance Ministry and later on when he was in the World Bank and I hold him as an individual in very high respect. But today I have great sympathy for him. I find him in a strait-jacket. Unfortunately, with all the good ideas that he may have, there is a lack of control over other Ministries. The hon. Finance Minister is not in a position to exercise control over the expenditure of other Ministries or the profligacy of other Ministries. Sometimes I find the hon. Finance in a state of helplessness.

I intend to speak on two main points. One is the economic impact of this Budget including on the social infrastructure, social welfare, family planning, etc., and the other is the impact of excise on small-scale industries and others. The Finance Minister is reported to have said in a television interview that he had taken a calculated risk and it is not a gamble.

Now let us look at the meaning of this calculated risk. What kind of calculations are there?

(The Deputy Chairman in the Chair)

I am sure he had made calculations last year also. He has got a term of experts in his Ministry and elsewhere and he himself is an expert. What do we find? We find in the revenue deficit that the Budget estimate is Rs. 17,630 crores and the revised estimate is Rs. 34,058 crores. For the year 1994-95 the Budget estimate is Rs. 32,772 crores. The Budget deficit for 1993-94 is revised from Rs. 4,314 crores to Rs. 9,060 crores and now it is estimated to Rs. 6,000 crores for 1994-95. The fiscal deficit—all these were calculations by those experts—is revised from Rs. 36,959 crores to Rs. 58,551

[Shri Viren J. Shah]

crores. Now it is supposed to be Rs. 55,000 crores. I would like to ask another question. How dependable are the calculations? How does one get confidence? When the increase in the revenue deficit is by 100 per cent, the budgetary deficit is over 100 per cent and the fiscal deficit is over 55 per cent one should examined these calculations in this context.

In this context, the hon. Finance Minister said, "I am not happy with the current fiscal deficit, but extra—ordinary circumstances were there on which I have no control." This is what he has said. Will the Minister enlighten this House how he is going to exercise control? I want to know what kind of extra—ordinary circumstances arose in the previous year which could not be dreamt of by such experts in the month of March, 1993 and which, they have confidence, would not arise in the next 12 months. He may kindly enlighten us on this point. Now, if the same risk arises, what is likely to happen? Before that I would like to recall one fact.

When the hon. Finance Minister presented his first Budget he took a grand overview of the past profligacy of the decade of 1980 and the impact of that. In the next four or five years, the fiscal deficit, which had gone up to 8.3 per cent, was to be brought down to six per cent in 1991-92, which went upto 6.5 per cent and in 1992-93 to five per cent, which went to 5.7 per cent and in 1993-94 to 4.7 per cent, which went to 7.38 per cent. In 1994-95 he is providing, six per cent though, three years back in the long term project, it was estimated to be 4.5 per cent for 1994-95, if my recollection is correct. The expectation was that in 1995-96 it would reach four per cent fiscal deficit putting the country on a good economic base. But the way in which we have gone about in 1993-94, it shakes ones confidence as to whether are we likely to reach those targets which are essential for the country's growth. That is why this question arises. How far are the Budget assumptions real?

That is why I gave you the example of the figures of 1993-94. Is there a tendency to over estimate revenue and under estimate expenditure?Has it happened in the last 12 months? If we look at the various Budget documents, we find a different basis, how the revenue expenditure has gone up or how the capital expenditure has gone down. If we assume that the past year's trends may continue, even the economists too assume that they make corrective factors, then the revenue deficit could become Rs. 65,000 crores because it was a hundred per cent increase in 1993-94. If we increase some estimates, the assumption would be Rs. 65.000 crores. The budgetary deficit would become Rs. 12,000 crores and the fiscal deficit would be Rs. 18,000 crores. Assuming that this trend continues and your calculations go as they went in the last 12 months, then this is the kind of senario that wou'd emerge. The same figures were mentioned in the last year's Budget speech. He said that Rs. 17.000 crores would become Rs. 34.000 crores. I think it needs to be examined. I am hoping that this would not happen. The floating deficit always fuels inflation. This kind of a deficit growth can disrupt growth.

I would like to congratulate the Finance Minister on one point which I have read. He has proposed to give a quarterly statement of the budget deficit, I appreciate it. I hope it will be for both the Houses.

Let us assume that the Finance Minister's projections are right and his calcu'ations do not go wrong.

How does he propose to meet this gap? Is he going to borrow money? Is he going to borrow to finance consumption which is not sustainable, which has happened in this country. Or is he going to borrow money from the public? How is he going to bring the excess money? If we borrow from outside, it means we are borrowing from the public. By doing that we are crowding out the private potential investors, particularly, the small and medium sector, apart from the poor people at large. I will come to that later. When the Government borrows money from the public, that is, from banks, it affects the most enterprising and most deserving medium and the small-scale sector's access to investible

funds. We are talking about expecting high industrial growth. On needs to look at it. It has been our experience that when the Government borrows funds from the public, these funds do not actually go for developmental purposes for which it is meant. Our former Prime Minister, the late Rajiv Gandhi, had said that, out of a rupee meant for development purpose, hardly 20 paise actually reached the target. This is the way in which funds are used. They are, in fact, used inefficiently. So, the reforms which were actually meant to promote industries small and medium, will in effect be starved to death. The hon. Finance Minister will have to explain how he is going to bridge the gap. Everyone has said that this will have an impact on inflation. A number of hon. Members have said that and I do not want to repeat it. Administered prices have been increased by Rs. 6,000 crores just a few weeks before the Parliament session. This has, in fact, become a practice with the Finance Minister. All increases used to be announced in the Budget and in the Parliament... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI JAGESH DESAI: Administered prices do not come under the Budget.

SHRI VIREN J. SHAH: I am grateful to the hon. Member for enlightening me on this point. I know that he was once the Minister of State for Finance in Maharashtra. Administered prices may not come under the Budget. But the people have to pay for it from their pockets. The price of sugar, the price of grains, the price of diesel etc. have been increased. I am talking of inflation. I was not talking about the Budget. But it is true that prices have been increased before the Budget. They have taken credit in the case of inflow of an public funds. They have said that they have got so much more from communications, from railways etc. All that comes under the Budget. When we resort to printing more money, it leads to money multiplying and also increases the inflationary pressure. Who suffers? The poor and the middle-class people suffer. Others also suffer. I can give you an example. Last year, my wife told me that she had purchased a particular quality of wheat at Rs. 4.50 a kilo. This year, the price of the same wheat has gone up to Rs. 9.10. We talk about inflation being only 8.1 per cent. But what matters is what an individual has to pay. The shopkeeper will not go by the WPI. He will not take into account the inflation rate which is 8.3 per cent and charge Rs. 5.20 instead of Rs. 4.50. This affects everyone and it needs to be looked into. The second thing which I noticed from the Budget is that it has not given any incentive for savings and investment. If you look at the data given in the Economic Survey, you will find that savings have come down from 24 per cent to 20.3 per cent in 1992-93. The figures for 1992-94 are not available. Of more importance is the household sector savings. It has come down from 20.3 per cent to 17.4 per cent. More than 80 per cent of our population contribute towards household savings. Household savings have gone down in these few years. And I could not find anything in this Budget——I would be enlightened if the Finance Minister does it——that reverses this trend. Now, I want to refer to the Finance Minister's speech in para 4 of page 3 where he says: "In formulating this Budget, I have sought to address six major tasks." I will deal with one or two of them only. In the sixth one, he says: "We seek to consolidate and deepen the progress that we have made in restoring the health of our banking system." Now what have we done? We have brought in an Ordinance. But this is based on the Narasimham Committee Report on fiscal reforms. If I recall rightly, amongst many things, two major recommendations of his were restructuring of banks and providing autonomy and integrity. With great regret, I would say that our action is rather tardy. The problem with the Government is that good ideas do not get implemented well in time. I do not know why it is so. Two years have passed since this Report was submitted to the Government and the Government accepted it and took it as a major task of the six tasks; yet, the restructuring of tanks and providing autonomy and integrity have not been implemented.

The second point is about the public sector enterprises. Credit was taken by the Government for expecting higher revenues from the public sector enterprises. Is it our experience that the revenues expected from the public sector enterprises are likely to be there or is there a possiblity of that going down because of the reduced Budgetary support? It may be, on a particular economic theory, true but what is the reality about these expected revenues? What we all have experienced is that—this has been said by the Members from the Treasury Benches including the Ministers several times and even the hon. Prime Minister in a different context, has said —unless the Government's interference is removed, there is no way the public sector enterprises can manage. And we see that instead of non-interference by the Government, in practice, it is exactly the opposite. You take the case of Air India or the Indian Airlines or the SAIL or the ONGC. There has been lack of accountability and there has been corruption in the last few years. The level of corruption and the amount of moneys that go out of this country on account of the ONGC's functioning in the last 10 years run into thousands of crores of rupees. Can the hon. Finance Minister do anything about it? Has he been able to do anything about it? I think he finds himself in a strait-jacket which is what I mentioned in the beginning of my speech. Similarly, a higher disinvestment is required, but that needs a careful thought.

There is one more thing that I would like to understand from the hon. Minister. We are taking big credit about the foreign exchange reserves touching the level of 13.6 billion dollars and we pat ourselves on the back for it. I was looking at the Economic Survey; it has been indicated that the NRI deposits of one year maturity alone are 11.6 billion dollars and the NRI deposits of one year maturity, which can be withdrawn, comes to 2 billion dollars or so. So, it comes to 13.6 billion dollars. It is understandable that either they may all be withdrawn or they may not be withdrawn. But the balance that we take as our own money is not really our own. Apart form that, you have to pay the debt in foreign exchange which is due in 1994-95, 1995-96 and 1996-97. So, this is something which I would like to be enlightened on. Then, while talking about NRI's we have always been encouraging the NRI investments and this is what the BJP feels and so also the ruling party; even the Prime Minister, in his London visit, has met the NRIs. But the report says that there was only a lukewarm response to it.

One of the major issues that were raised was about dual citizenship. This issue has been going on for the last six years. Many countries issue passports. But, here, we have a peculiar mentality in the Home Ministry, at the junior level, that if we do that then the terrorists will come, as if terrorists require passports for coming; we have seen thousands of them coming by all kinds of ways. Well, you might even want to look at that aspect. Talking about NRIs, we may want to look at the example of China. All the world knows that the Chinese living outside China have brougt in large funds. Why is it that it is not happening in our country? What are the factors? Several conferences were held. They have given their problems. But we are not moving.

SHRI JAGESH DESAI: There cannot be one-way traffic.

SHRI VIREN J. SHAH: Mr. Jagesh Desai, I have limited time. I hope you don't mind.

One of the things in disinvestment is valuation. The Public Accounts Committee was seized of the matter about valuation of the shares two years back. And I understand that similiarly, right now, there are the ONGC shares and the SBI shares. I heard from a number of people. They expressed an apprehension and danger of very artificially low value to the extent that the Government would then be a loser.

Now, I want to speak about rural development in which case the hon. Finance

Minister has spoken very highly, in high-sounding words. But what are the funds allocated for rural development? The increase in the outlay for rural development is Rs. 1,400 crores in a total plan of Rs. 70,000 crores in agriculture. There is actually a reduction there from Rs. 2,246 crores to Rs. 1302 crores. You might look at the Demands for Grants of the Central Government for the Agriculture Ministry under Item-V. The numbers are there. And for dairying and animal husbandry, the reduction is from Rs. 558 crores to Rs. 380 crores. In a country which is predominantly agriculture, if you neglect agriculture and animal husbandry—this is in the context of the agricultural growth being consistently low; capital investment in agriculture so far being low—how does one see a great transformation which is the fifth task of the Finance Minister? He said, "fifthly and most importantly, we must re-orient our development, etc., most effectively to problems of poverty, unemployment, etc.". Now, how do we do that when you decide to give such a small outlay agriculture and animal husbandry in a plan like this? I think, one would like to be enlightened on this. In fact I would like to mention one sentence stated here, "the Government must find ways to make massive investments in social sectors." And the whole House will support that. But, are we doing that?

Madam, I want to quickly talk about the impact of excise. Though the approach is good in principle, what has been the ground reality? I am sure, the hon. Minister is aware that the ground reality has become horrendous. From all over India, from Punjab and Gujarat and Maharashtra and everywhere, a large number of people involved in small-scale sector have come here. They are in serious troubles. In fact a large number of factories, entirely in Gujarat and some in Maharashtra, and perhaps some in Punjab, have been closed since 1st March. May I request Mr. Jacob to kindly spare the hon. Minister's attention because I am talking about the very vast small-scale sector which has closed down? A large number of factories have closed down. Why have they close down? A number of Associtions came here. I talked to them. I told them that there is a particular philosophy which cannot be challenged, which we cannot change. The need for the Government for money is there. And this is the answer they gave me, which I want to mention here. They said, "We are prepared to pay them. Our problem is—this problem is of weavers and small engineering units and power-loom people and others—the problem of serious harassment and procedure." Here is a man. He has two sons and may be one or two other members. They work the whole day. They cannot make them write excise papers. This is happening. People of Rajkot and Jamnagar told me that right from the 1st of March, the excise inspectors came there and said, "Today, you cannot take out the goods unless you fulfil the following formalities." They have closed down. And this is a matter of serious concern. I will give you a specific example. That is of kerosene burner and stove manufacturers. There is no duty on them. There is a duty on the spare parts. So, the excise inspectors insist; "Every evening you prepare a report as to how many parts you make and pay the duty on them. Next day, when you use those parts in making stoves and burners and sell them, claim the refund for that."

They even don't know how to write and they cannot engage people. That is what they say and I think something has to be done about it.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: And small pump manuacturers.

SHRI VIREN J. SHAH: Yes, the pump people also. The diesel engine people came to me. Diesel engines upto 10 H.P. which are for lift irrigation, got ane excis duty of 10 per cent. On the one hand, we give subsidy to agriculture and on the other hand, we levy this excise duty. There is one suggestion that was made for the consideration of the hon. Finance Minister. They say that we will pay but instead of gate pass invoicng, why don't you introduce two things? One is, like quarterly Cen-

[Shri Viren J. Shah]

tral sales tax that they pay, or the quarterly sales tax that they pay, you design an excise form and they should be asked to pay every quarter, that is, once in three months by filling up the papers and going to the excise authorities to pay. They want to pay the amount that the Government wants them to pay. Their second suggestion is, instead of gate pass invoice, have presumptive MODVAT on inputs. You decide the inputs product-wise and once you set up the MODVAT, you charge them. This was the suggestion, because they are not able to solve the problem of harassment to them. So, the suggestion is to broadly classify the inputs product-wise. Then, I asked them about the MODVAT and they say that it is only illusory because a small fellow goes and buys 10 Kgs of material but he cannot claim MODVAT because he cannot get a gatepass invoice. So, for him, there is no MODVAT in reality. The Government assumes that they get relief under MODVAT but they do not get it. There is also a problem about the gate pass for the rejected or scrap material which goes for re-cycling or repair. Please do not insist on every movement on the finished goods that come for processnig but make it on presumptive basis. Some people from the export houses came to me and said that their exports have also stopped because 30 to 35 per cent of the manufactured goods were manufactured in India by the small--scale sector and that has stopped. The result is that it has affected Indias reputation also. My submission is that a drastic re-consideration is called for because the Economic Survey has said that growth is going to be labour-intensive but it is not reflected in the Budget in case of the small-scale sector or the powerlooms or handlooms and even the cotton weavers told me that on cotton yarn, earlier the duty was 60 paise per Kg. and now it is Rs. 3.60 per Kg, which is a 600 per cent increase. How do we correct this imbalance? I pose the question to the Minister and the Minister of State answered that the duty was wrongly charged and it took two and a half months to correst it. I submit that this time, whatever corrections are to be made, may be made earlier, without waiting for a particular Deputy Secretary to say; Yes he did make a mistake, and be free from it. Excise duty was reduced on 23 items including the cosmetics but there was increase on 6 items including cigarettes tobacco and steel. I normally do not speak on steel, but the steel people insisted that I should represent them in Parliament. I will just say two sentences. There was import duty reduction from 85 to 50 per cent and an increase in *ad valorem* from 300 to 400 per cent. But mere countervailing duty does not help. A large number of consumers have already switched over to imports saying that they are going in for imports only. Can anything be done about it because there is no reduction in tariff on the inputs like nickel. There is only a marginal reduction for inputs like refractories or scrap, which was increased and brought down. If the country is going to be globally competitive, we have to look at the reality to compete with other countries.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Only three minutes are left.

SHRI VIREN J. SHAH: Our rate of interest is three times higher. Our power tariff is three times higher compared to what prevails in Turkey. Our port handling cost, freight, energy, hydro-carbon base also adds to the cost and there is no effective scheme for anti-dumping machanism. The United States has imposed a duty of 225 per cent on stainless steel products going from India to the USA and this became effective on the day they decided to take up the matter. Madam, I would now like to say something on an important problem, namely, population control. I do not find any serious attention paid, due consideration given, in the Budget to this aspect. For example, in the case of health, the increase is from Rs. 1,149 crores to Rs. 1,255 crores. In the case of family planning, the increase is from Rs. 1,507 crores to Rs. 1.678 crores Is this the kind of consideration that we want to give to this social aspect that we are talking about? Shrimati Kamla Sinha talked about the condition of the poor people. We have been talking about this problem from the time of Jawaharlal

Nehru. I would like to submit that there are three categories of couples who require family planning. Category 1; those with no motivation; they want to have more children for their economic development; they make their children work. Category 2: those who have motivation, but have no access to contraceptives. These are the people who are living in the slum areas; landless labour, non-agricultural workers, living in small townships. Category 3: those who have motivation and access. My submission is that the people in the second category—people living in the slums; non-agricultural workers, landless labour—must be the immediate target of the Government. The long-term target should be the first category. I do not find this Budget having considered this fundamental reality at all. Funds allocated are very inadequate. Here, I would like to point out that in the last two years, Iran, Indonesia and Malaysia—these are Islamic countries—and China, which is a Communist country, have brought in legislative measures to control population. Would India consider a similar thing as has been done by these countries? I am not talknig about Japan or the United States of America. I am talking about Iran, Indonesia. Malasia and China. Would we take a lesson from them?

In regard to the new economic policy of the Government, a major problem is that no efforts have been made to explain to the people of India the benefits or otherwise of the economic restructuring. Here, I would cite the example of Mexico. What does the President of Mexico do? Twice a week, he goes to the villages and urban areas and tells the people: 'You did not have a school last time; now, you have a school; you did not have drinking warter last time; now, you have drinking water; there were no economic activities earlier; now, you have; how did it happen?'; It is because we sold this particular public sector unit; it is because we saved the expenditure there and made the money available to you'. This is how the President of Mexico explains things to the people. The people have started taking interest. The people have started taking interest in the economic restructuring undertaken by the Government. The people have started telling the Government: 'Please sell more such units'. This

Another problem connected with it is that no effort has been made to change the mind-set of the bureaucracy. No effort has been made to reorient their attitude. I have heard one of the senior officials saying that it was a question of changing the mind-set of the bureaucracy. Have we made any effort during the last last two-and-a-half years to bring about a change, to change the mind-set of the people, from the level of Deputy Secretary upwards? Have we made any efforts to reorient the thinking of the bureaucracy? I am not sure whether we have done it. I am not aware of any sustained efforts having been made during this period. I do not know whether the Finance Minister is in a position to change even the mind-set of some of his own Ministerial collegues.

THE MINISTRY OF FINANCE (SHRI MANMOHAN SINGH): You change the mind-set of the people in your own Party.

SHRI VIREN J. SHAH: My mind-set is okay. I will not....

SHRI MENTAY PADMANABHAM: They are unchangeable.

SHRI VIREN J. SHAH: I am talking about changing the mind-set of those people who are implementing the economic reforms. I am not sitting as Deputy Secretary in your Ministry.

Lastly, Madam, no serious attention has been paid, no serious efforts have been made during the last two-and-a half years, to reduce corruption in public life. In fact, it has increased, affecting the whole socio-economic fabric of the country, affecting the Budget of the Finance Minister and affecting the life of the people. Therefore, I would request the hon. Financme Minister to take a serious note of this and see whether he can bring down, reduce—efforts should be made under the collective leadership of the Government to control corruption so that the people are benefited. Thank you.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Before I call upon Mr. Sanjay Dalmia to speak, I have to inform Members that there has been some mistake somewhere. Mr. Jethmalani; who should have been allowed Janata Dal's time, was, somehow, listed under 'Others' and was given more time. We are really having a deficit balance sheet. Mr. Sanjay Dalmia, I know you are making your maiden speech. I would have liked to give you more time, but there is constant of time, Therefore, you please co-operate. Only nine minutes are left out of the time allotted to 'Others'. You can speak, but please be brief.

SHRI SANJAY DALMIA (Uttar Pradesh): Madam, I would not take more than nine minutes.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Nine minutes should be divided among nine people. There are many heads where the time has to be divided like money.

SHRI SANJAY DALMIA: Madam Deputy Chairman, I would like to give two suggestions so far as the budget and the economic policy are concerned. I will start with one of the basic principles which, I feel, should be adhered to and implemented as early as posssible. The basic principle is that every Indian should be entitled to five basic necessities, that is, food, shelter, clothing, medical care and education. Are we going to provide these bassic necessities? (*Interruptions*). I am not yielding.

SHRI VIREN J. SHAH: His maiden speech should not be interrupted.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Who is interrupting?

SHRI SANJAY DALMIA: What I want to say is that there should be a time-bound programme for providing these five basic necessities to every Indian. I do not think any of our economic policies has given a thought to this aspect. I would like to know how the resources required to make available these basic necessities are going to be generated. We have had eight Five Year Plans. But we do not know whether the total amount required or providing these five necessities has been worked out in any Plan. We would like to know the amount which has to be generated to provide these five basic necessities.

Now I come to the question of recent rationalisation in the import duty tariff which has a direct bearing on the Indian industry, foreign investment. I welcome foreign investment. I have nothing against the foreign investment, but personally speaking, should it come in the areas where we require foreign investment or should it come in areas which are not coming under basic necessities?

Then, Madam, recently the impot duty on capital goods has been revised. The interest rates have been reduced in the last one or two years, but the Indian interest rates are still higher as compared to international standarads.

Plant and equipment which the Indian industrialists have imported in the last so many years have been subjected/to very, very heavy duty. Recently it has been reduced and a benefit under MODVAT has been given to the capital goods industry, but this is going to start from today. What happens to the industries which have already been put up and which have to meet the challenge of imported goods at a much lower import duty? You have given benefit under MODVAT to the capital goods industry from this year. Is it possible to give this benefit retrospective from at least four to five years so that whatever additional money has been spent by the Indian entrepreneur on importing plant and equipment or buying can be brought down?

Madam, we know that we can meet any foreign competition but unfortunately, we are being subject to unfair competition. This is not going to be useful and helpful to our country.

The other point which I want to bring to the notice of the hon. Finance Minister is that unfortunately till yesterday I did not know that in this country agriculture is having a negative subsidy. I was somehow under the impression all these years that agricultural sector is being subsidised. We are giving subsidy on fertiliser, on water, on power. But, unfortunately, if you take the total subsidy which you gave, it is much less

than what was taken by way of prices of the agricultural commodities which the farmers have given for the common pool. My point is, you have to develop agriculture. Sixty per cent of our people are dependent upon agriculture. If you don't want to give a subsidy, don't give it, but don't give a negative subsidy. If agriculture is going to remain backward, you may do anything, but nothing is going to happen and your economy is not going to grow at the rate at which you would like it to grow. My point is, 60—70 per cent of the people are being subjected to a negative subsidy, and they are being forced to pay money for the urban areas. There are the urban poor, I have nothing against them. Let the Government of India pay the proper price for agriculture. If they want to give subsidies to the urban poor, let them subsidize themselves. But why should it be done by the Indian agriculturists? I will give you an instance. The prices of industrial products go on going up, but the prices of agricultural commodities do not rise at the same pace. Why should it happen so? For example, prices of cigarettes have gone up, but tobacco prices do not go up. Jute prices go up, but raw jute prices do not go up. My point is, firstly there must be a parity between agricultural prices and industrial prices. In case it is not possible to have it, let the benefit be mopped up by the public exchequer instead of that going to individual industries. This is one thing which must be done. If we want to bring a correct balance between agriculture and industry, there must be proper input prices for industry and agriculture and there must be a rationalization in that.

The other point I want to make is about the power scenario in India. We know that there is power shortage in almost all the States, and the Government of India is giving a lot of incentives to bring in new power projects. I do not understand this minimum guaranteed return which has been given for new power projects, which is limited to seven power projects only. Why should it be limited to seven power projects only? Why can't this minimum guaranteed return be given to all the power projects, provided they meet the norms which you have put? Secondly, why should this minimum guaranteed return theory be only for coal-based or gas-based power projects? Why can't a similar minimum guaranteed return be given to non-conventional power projects?

Madam, as you know, wind power is being harnessed for power production in some of the areas. of Gujarat and Tamil Nadu and, probably, one or two other areas. The cost of producing power by this method is very, very inexpensive. There are some subsidies which are available from the State Governments, but they are not enough to have a parity with the non-conventional energy and coal-based or gas-based power projects. Because there are constraints on coal-based power projects, because there are constraints on gas-based power projects, you want to develop the non-conventional power projects. If you want to develop non-conventional power projects, why can't you put them at least on par with the coal-based and gas-based projects? You give incentives to gas-based and coal-based plants. Why not give similar incentives, if not more, at least for the non-conventional power projects? This is one thing which I would like him to examine.

Coming to the problem faced by various States in mobilizing resources, the State Governments are dependant, to a large extent, on Central assistance. Now what I am trying to say is that recently the Finance Minister has announced that in two years they will not pay the Treasury Bills of the Reserve Bank but they will resort to market borrowings for meeting their finances. What I am trying to say is,

4 P.M.

why can't a similar facility be extended to the State Governments? Those who have got a good track record are allowed to finance part of the resources in a limited way by way of mobilising the resources from the public. Why can't we

[Shri Sanjay Dalmia]

allow them to raise as much resources from the public as they can? Why limit them to a small figure and make them dependent upon the Central Government? If they can raise the resources by their own methods, it may be much better from them. They will be less and less dependent upon the Central Government. But the additional resources which they raise should not be adjusted from the Plan, which the Central Government has proposed for them. Otherwise there will be no incentive for them.

One point I would like to make about the exit policy. A lot of discussion about it took place between the Government and the industry and also the prospective foreign investors, who want to come and invest, but are not clear about the exit policy. What I am trying to say is that there are companies both in the public and the private sectors, which are not doing well, and are incurring continuous losses. In some of the cases the losses are much more than the wages. What I am trying to say is that in such cases it is better to keep on paying the wakes and stop the additional loss which these companies are incurring. I think it would be in the interest of the economy to allow such industries to keep on paying the wages. At least you will be saving an additional loss. This would be a beginning of a new exit policy. If we start from here, we can then go on to the second step. I know the problem of growing unemployment. That is why I am not suggesting on that point. What I am trying to say is that you keep on paying wages but save the loss.

I am happy that most of the recommendations of the Chalijah Committee have been accepted by the Finance Minister and that he has introduced a new way of levying tax-MODVAT. I hope this will solve most of the problems which are being faced today. What I am trying to say is that for items which have been left out, there is no reason why they should not be subjected to VAT. Since you have more or less completed the exercise, the one or two items which have been lect out should be considered for inclusion to rationalise the whole system.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please conclude. There is no time. I have Mr. Jagmohan, Prof. Saurin Bhattacharya, Shri Mahapatra and Shri Anant Prakash Gautam. I ten minutes they have to speak. Then the Minister has to reply.

SHRI SANJAY DALMIA: Madam, I will forgo my other points, but the last point I want to make. It is about privatisation of the banking and insurance sectors. It is a welcome step. But I do not understand why it is taking so much time. It is very easy to define norms and the way you are going to allow setting up of banks and insurance companies. Once these norms are finalised, you can allow more and more people to set up banks and insurance companies to have promised returns which will help the banking and insurance sectors.

Madam, I would have spoken on one or two more points, but I am foregoing them in view of your request. I am sure you will take this gesture into consideration and next time when I speak you will allow will allow me more time.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Sure. There will be many more occasions. You have just come. We have to have the Finance Minister's reply also. Now, Mr. Jagmohan. I don't have to tell you, because I know you will be brief in view of the time constraint.

[The Vice-Chairman (Shri Md. Salim) in The Chair]

SHRI JAGMOHAN (Nominated): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, when I heard the Finance Minister saying in his Budget Speech

"लमहों ने खता की थी,

सदियों ने सजा पाई।"

I wondered whether he had not voiced something that lay hidden in his intellectual sub-consciousness and foretold what might turn out to be a verdict of history on the measures taken since mid-

1991. There are many straws in the wind —huge fiscal and revenue deficits poor work culture, low productivity and widening disparities of income, etc.,—which point to the grave dangers ahead. Does the Finance Minister, like a hero in Senecca play, know the uncomfortable reality and yet persuades himself to believe that, somehow or the other, the tragedy would pass him by? I wish him luck and hope that while reciting the above couplet, he was merely acting as a lover of good poetry and not making a prophecy albeit sub consciously, about the outcome of the structural adjustments called 'economic reforms'.

I am not against reforms *per se*. But I am appalled at the superficiality of the approach which believes that reforms in a limited sphere and that, too, in a limited way can bring about the desired improvements. If the country has to rise as a great entity and not fall into an 'also ran' category, it has to undergo a total reform, reform of its politics, its administration, its institutions and, above all, its social and cultural forces that constitute the soul of the nation.

What has dismayed me no less is the imitative approach. In one of his celebrated poems, Rebert Frost said:

"Two roads diverged in a wood, and I—

I took the one less travelled by."

Unfortunately, the Government has taken recourse to a beaten path. Could we not as a nation, with an ancient tradition rooted in the power of mind that produced the most original, profound and elevating thought, have a vision of our own and care out a new path and evolve a new design for our society sspecially suited to our requirements? The Finance Minister had also recited another couplet:

'मैं अकेला ही चला था,
जानिबे मंजिल मगर,

लोग आते ही गये और
कारवां बनता गया।"

He was, I am afraid, not factually correct. He did not move alone. He simply hiteched the Indian economy to a wagon designed elsewhere—a wagon that is operated through remote control. I wish the the Government had been more creative, rather than imitative. The 'middle path' that is now being talked about will certainly be a kuchcha path, uneven, uncertain and bumpy.

The new dispensation is primarily based upon the decomposed garbage of the civilisation that was once great and the new cult of consumerism and expediency of the hybrid elites of the present. Under it we are having the worst of both the worlds. The two streams, one of consumerism, callousness and corruption and the other of indiscipline, indifference and nihilism are getting merged and rising in a wave that may sweep away whatever little remains of our 'hasti', our heritage which we preserved for centuries, ravages of time nothwithstanding. The Finance Minister quoted:

"कुछतो है कि हस्ती मिटती
नहीं हमारी,

यूं तो रहा है दुश्मन दौरे जमां हमारा।"

To me it is pretty clear that if the poisonous threads of the social and cultural web in which the economic dispensation is enmeshing the country are not immediately removed, our 'hasti' would be strangulated and choked to oblivion. I would once again hoist the warning signal and say:

'न समझोगे तो मिट जाओगे हिंदुस्तां वालो,
तुम्हारी दास्तां तक भी, न होगी दास्तानों में।"

At present, our tastes are being manipulated, our minds continuously bombarded from the sky and our false prophets applauded. Should we not draw any lesson from the recent events from the erstwhile USSR? Gorbachev, too, was hailed as a new Prophet and raised to a high pedestal from which he was pushed down, leaving him alone to lick his wounds, and, at the same time, making the world safe for the only 'power' in tre world Well, I have something more to say and if you permit me one or two minutes more, I shall feel obliged.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI MD. SALIM): Yes, try to conclude within three minutes.

SHRI JAGMOHAN: Right, Sir. To provide the statistical base for the apprehensions voiced above, may I point out that I have got all th efigures relating to the fiscal deficit and the revenue deficit with me? But I will not go into them. But I would like to point out that in the year 1996-1999, about 30 billion dollars will have to be paid as instalment and repayment of interest and today, about 30 per cent to 40 per cent of ourliabilities are not backed by any assets. This comment has been made by our eminent economist. The produtivity of the much adumberated Green Revolution is also very low. I have got the figures but I will skip them over. But, what I want to impress is that I see no improvement, either in work culture or in productivity, and that is the essense of reforms if you really want to have reforms. Black money is mounting. But I will again skip the figures. But what is still uncomfortable is that the Government is becoming more and more permissive about the corruption in public life. The Government policies are encouraging—this in my view is important—saving abroad and profligacy at home, thus making way for a new sophisticated form of colonisation in which we would be assisgned the subsidiary role and made to believe that the export-oriented growth would lead to our salvation while, in actual practice, it would mean export of our environment and natural resourcesand cheap labour and competition between the poor countries so far as the developing world is concerned. The economic power would get concentrated in the hands of two hundred to three hundred multi-national's of the five big powers and wherever there is concentration of power, human dignity and human liberty would always be undermined. Gandiji himself talked of the global village but he also wanted the village to become a globe in itself and that lesson we are totally for getting in wha we are doing today. Nobody is against globalisation. But I am definitely agtinst globalisation. But I am difinitely against the subsidiary role that is being assigned to us and we are being put in a strait-jacket and we will have to follow that course. Self-containment and self-reliance are very important because as the poet hts said:

"टूट जाय तो और ले आयेंगे,
जाम ये खम से मेरा जामे सिफाल अच्छा है।"

There are other points which I would like to make but there is no time, I will not be able to complete that proposition. So, I will not start it. But I would like to say that I do not want to repeat those points that have been raised by my friends. But the statistical points are different. But if you want to see the real progress that has been made during the last three or four years, you have to take into consideration so many things. People have spoken about the rural development. I do not want to say anything about that. You just travel in any train going to wards Delhi or any metropolitan city, you will see the open defecation ground which will tell you the progress that we are making. The liberalisation and the marketisation are going to create more problems and our cities are going to become primitive cities where the people would be burning angithis in the slums, and in one room, ten to twenty persons would be living with no hygienic facilities they would be getting sick and lowering the productivity of the nation as a whole. You have Marutis and so many cars, but if you want to travel from Delhi to Chandigarh, you will see that it takes now much more time than it used to take three or four years ago. No investment is being made in infrastructure. If you see the cities, they are full of slums and diseases and this will lower the productivity of the nation and also its income. Therefore, I would say that a new vision is required. We have to, I would say, arise, awake and then to reconstruct and recreate our economy, our politics, our total system as a whole. Thank you very much, Sir.

PROF. SAURIN BHATTACHARYA (West Bengal): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I may be excused if as a student of

history, and like my friend, Mr. Ashok Mitra who is a reputed economist, I begin with a digression into history. Our Finance Minister begins his Budget speech with humility but goes on to recount how the Prime Minister of the country started with a minority Government and then proceeded to make the economy more and more strong. But out of humility, Dr. Singh refrained from referring to the immoral way in which that minority has been converted into a majority; that also should be taken into account when evaluating a Government and its performance. And, at the same time, a recounting of certain political aspects is also important because the economy, in a way, controls the politics also. At the beginning of the regime of the present Government, a debate is on whether the Congress has given up the Nehruvian path. And Mr. P. V. Narasimha Rao gave an interview to the Press stating that the Congress has not given up the Nehruvian path. Now the situation is that in the Congress, the entire Congress, there is not a person who is so low as to swear by either Nehru or even Smt. Indira Gandhi or; perhaps; Rajiv Gandhi; from whose time the new economic thinking started. These are all matters of the past, Something they want to wish away, an economy which they hold responsible for all the ills that the country faces in the economic field.

So far as we are concerned, we have never been admirers of the Nehruvian economy. The mixed economy propagated by him used to be considered by us as a variant of the capitalist economy. There is no doubt about it. So, for us there is no difficulty in this change-over or in this somersault of the ruling party. We have been Marxists, Leninists and we continue to be Marxists—Leninists and we consider if this capitalist system with its propped up foreign investment is to be replaced, it will be through Marxism—Leninism. However, someone from that side or, perhaps all of from this side tried to make out how Marxism—Leninism failed. As Mr. Ram Jethmalani stated, ctpitalism has got humanity from Communism or Socialism. Now this sort of a compliment does not enthrall us. The Finance Minister's humanity is matched by his denigration of the country. In his calculations the only super power is the United States of America. When Mr. Clinton mode a derogttory remark against India, in Calcutta Dr. Singh said, "the U.S.A. is only the super power which tries to dominate every country in the world and India is only a small part in their calculation." I had occasion to put question in this House. The Minister of State in the Ministry of Finance, Dr. Abrar Ahmed, said that you should see it in the overall context, that is, the denigration of the country has to be considered in the overall context of what Dr. Singh said. He said that he was magnanimous enough to say, "when India gains economic strength the industrial power every country will honour her." If this is the type of utterance he makes, there is a saying in Bangali: It used to be said in the earlier days, "we might be poor but we are not despicable." The industrial power may or may not honour us as the Finance Minister of the Congress-I Government says, but in his eyes the county remains despicable so long as it doesn't gain economic power. He quoted the Prime Minister. Even the Prime Minister was letding that path. After Mr. Clinton's statement he requested him to make Pakistan to sit with India. If it is not inviting a third power or internationalising the Kashmir issue, what is it? Only the Home Minister of the country, perhaps, in one sense true to his responsibility, ctutioned the White House that the Indian Government had to come out more openly against the US threats, the US criticisms and the US blackmail. This aspect, I think, should be taken into consideration because of the plight, the situation, the condition to which the country has reached.

Now, I cite a few more aspects, as many other aspects have been touched by everybody. There is a deficit. This time it is about Rs. 6,000 crores. Then the customs duties have been reduced,

[Prof. Saurin Bhattacharya]
the import duties have been reduced in order to subserve the interests of the foreign ctpitalists and our national capitalists.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI MD. SALIM): Please conclude now.

PROF. SAURIN BHATTACHARYA: Dr. Singh has offered an apology to the International Monetary Fund for prepaying the IMF debt and assured that in case of necessity he would seek support from the IMF. It is for the first time that we heard that a creditor has to be sure, has to assure the public, has to assure in the national Budget that an approach will be made for further loan, let not the IMF get angry.

I would conclude with an observation by an economist who says that last year the deficit was Rs. 4000 to start with. In the revised estimates it was Rs. 9,000. This year, it is Rs. 6,000. It will rise to Rs. 15,000 when we calculate proportionately. And with Rs. 15,000 as deficit, besides the fiscal deficit of Rs. 54,000—which, to Dr. Singh is something which is not to be taken into account; it is such a small sum with this Rs. 15,000 what will we have to do? We will have to have inflation—inflation with the low level of purchasing power with the erosion of purchasing power, there will be less savings and with less savings there will be less investment. What is the way out? There should be some way of recovery from this situation. There will be nothing to recover. But what has been suggested by Dr. Singh inviting foreign investment privatising everything beginning from port, railways, telephones and every public utility service owned by the public sector, with more and more privatisation all around, on a very false presumption that private industry is efficient and the public sector undertakings are all inefficient. This is the presumption which will bring the country to utter destruction. Therefore, there is nothing to depend on this Government. The sooner they quit, the better it will be for the country.

SHRI TARA CHARAN MAJUMDAR (Assam): Mr. Vice-Chairman, I thank you very much for giving me this opportunity to speak on the General Budget. This Budget is a fraud on the vast majority of the poor people of India. The Government has gone all out to hike the prices of essential commodities outside the Budget and without the approval of the Parliament which has resulted in untold sufferings and deprivation to the millions of poor people in the country. Sir, the existence of huge food—stocks becomes meaningless when the poor men have no access to food. The poor people are going to be priced out of the Public Distribution System with abnormal hike in the prices of essential commodities. The promise made by the ruling party in its election manifesto to roll back the prices to 1991 level has proved to be a great bluff to the people of this country.

[The Vice-Chairman (Shri V. Narayanasamy) in the Chair]. There is no rational for the hike in prices of diesel and petrol when the price of crude oil in the international market is at its lowest. The abnormal hike in the prices of petrol and diesel has its impact on all the essential commodities. The said increase in the prices of diesel and petrol would help the petroleum dealers to earn thousands of crores of rupees.

The people, at large, do not understand globalisation, liberalisation and other economic jargons. What they understand is that they have a right to two square meals, a place to live, minimum medical facilities and education for children. With abnormal increase in the prices of essential commodities, the PDS will become out of bounds for the poor. Millions of Indians have no roof over their heads. They live on pavements or in slums. In the metropolitan cities, they live in sub-human conditions. As regards medical services life saving drugs and even ordinary medicines are not available not only in the metropolitan cities but also in the national capital! Patients have to obtain medicines from outside the country. The condition prevailing in the villages are much worse. The Primary Health Centres are housed in dilapidated buildings. Doctors and medical men are not available. Not only medicines even

ordinary lotions and dressig material also not available here. In most cases, doctors are not available even to write the prescription. This is the reality. Unemployment has assumed alarming proportions. The Employment Exchanges are over flowing. There are millions of youths who sit outside the offices of Registrars. In Assam, jobs are being sold openly by politicians and *dalals*. The Budget has not provided for generating mass employment opportunities. There is also no provision made in the Budget for expansion of agro-based small industries. This would have gone a long way in generating employment. As no provision has been made for the village based industries, scope for employing the village youth is bleak. No financial discipline has been imposed on the States. My State and practically the entire North-East has remained backward; in the last four decades and a half, nothing has been done to bring these States out of their backwardness. Infrastructure facilities have not been provided for setting up industries. Land transportation and communication remains suspended due to floods. Nothing is being done to check floods in spite of the existence of the Brahmaputra Commission for over a decade. Crores of rupees have been spent, but nothing has been achieved. Power generation has been neglected in spite of the potential that exists there for producing hydro-electricity. Nothing has been done to tap this huge potential. For lack of infrastructure facilities, it is unthinkable to have industries in that area. Although these States are Special Category States, this year's Budget does not have any provision for improving the infrastructure facilities available in these States There is no programme to encourage cottage-based industries. The cottage-based industries can generate mass employment. Without having a comprehensive plan to bring these areas on at par with other developed States and without making provision for the same in the Budget, all talk of removing disparities becomes meaningless. We do not find any special provision in the Budget as regards the North-East area. Thank you.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY): Shrimati Satya Bahin. You have only five minutes after which I will call the next speaker.

श्रीमती सत्या बहिन (उत्तर प्रदेश) : उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, वित्त मंत्री जी ने जो बजट पेश किया है, इसके लिये मैं सभी मंत्रियों और खासकर मनमोहन सिंह जी को बधाई देना चाहती हूं। यह बजट एक प्रभावी अर्थशास्त्री का बजट है न कि किसी राजनैतिज्ञ का। वास्तव में यह बजट ग्रामीण विकास के लिये बहुत उपयोगी और आशाजनक है। जहां तक उदारीकरण की प्रक्रिया की बात है, इसको हमारी सरकार ने सही और संतुलित दिशा दी है और देश के आर्थिक विकास के लिये रास्ता दिखाया है। मैं अपने उन साथियों को याद दिलाना चाहती हूं जिन्होंने इस बजट की, केवल विपक्ष की अपनी भूमिका को प्रदर्शित करते हुये आलोचना की है, वह यह याद रखें कि जब कांग्रेस के हाथों में सत्ता आयी थी तो उस समय देश आर्थिक रूप से बिल्कुल जर्जर और लगभग दीवालिया था। देश में ही नहीं बल्कि विदेशों में भी उसकी साख क्षीण होती जा रही थी। उस वक्त कांग्रेस ने सत्ता संभाली और हमारे वित्त मंत्री माननीय मनमोहन सिंह जी इस सरकार में वित्त मंत्री होकर आये और उन्होंने देश की जर्जर हालत को संभालने के लिये काम किया और पहले ही वर्ष में उसका परिणाम हमारे सामने आया। यह माननीय मंत्री जी का चौथा बजट है। उनके प्रयासों, से सरकार की आर्थिक नीतियों से जो उपलब्धियां हुई, इससे पूर्व की सरकारों ने जो देश का सोना गिरवी रखा था उसको वापस लाया गया और तमाम चुनौतियों के बावजूद हमारी आर्थिक स्थिति संतुलित रही है और निरन्तर एक के बाद एक उपलब्धियां, हम हासिल करते रहे हैं। यह बजट शिक्षा, गरीबी उन्मूलन और ग्रामीण विकास के लिये बड़ा लाभदायक होगा। यह बजट एक उत्पादकता प्रधान बजट है और इससे हमारे आय के स्रोत बढ़ेंगे, हमारा जो भुगतान संतुलन है वह ठीक रहेगा और लोगों को नये रोजगार के

[श्रीमती सत्यां वहिन]

अवसर मिलेंगे, विदेशी मुद्रा में बढ़ोत्तरी होगी । मैं माननीय मंत्री जी से यह कहना चाहूंगी कि जहां तक आर्थिक विकास का और ग्रामीण विकास का संबंध है, हमारे देश की 80 प्रतिशत जनता गांवों में रहती है और जब तक ग्रामों का विकास नहीं होगा, तब तक देश में विकास के कोई मायना नहीं होंगे । मैं इतना चाहती हूं कि हमारी आर्थिक व्यवस्था में जो विसंगतियां हैं उनको तरफ गंभीरता से ध्यान देना पड़ेगा । मैं यह भी कहना चाहती हूं कि जो आर्थिक रूप से पिछड़े हुये क्षेत्र हैं, उनको पुनः पहचान करनी होगी । जिन क्षेत्रों का पहले पता नहीं था, उनका सर्वे हुआ था और जो पिछड़े हुये पाये गये हैं उनके लिये, उनके आर्थिक विकास के लिये नये-नये प्रोत्साहन दिये गये, वहां पर नये उद्योग धंधे लगाये गये और वे क्षेत्र विकसित हुये । लेकिन आज भी ऐसे बहुत से क्षेत्र हैं जो वास्तव में पिछड़े हुये हैं । उनकी पहचान आपको करनी पड़ेगी और उनके विकास का काम करना पड़ेगा । इसके लिये उन स्त्रों की पहचान करनी होगी, उन क्षेत्रों को आपको खोजना पड़ेगा और उनके विकास पर ध्यान देना होगा । इन क्षेत्रों में रेल और सड़क यातायात के साधनों को वृद्धि करनी होगी और हर तरह की सुविधायें देकर उन क्षेत्रों में औद्योगिकीकरण को प्रोत्साहन देना होगा । इसके लिये सरकार अनुदान देकर लोगों को आमंत्रित करे कि वे वहां उद्योग लगायें । अगर आप ऐसा करेंगे तो यह उन क्षेत्रों के विकास के लिये एक बहुत अच्छी बात होगी ।

महोदय, मैं एक बात विदेशी बैंकों के बारे में कहना चाहूंगी । जो विदेशी बैंक हैं, उन्होंने हमारे देश में उपभोक्तावाद को बढ़ावा दिया है । यह जो विदेशी बैंक हैं ये हमारा जो नियंत्रित बैंक-रिजर्व बैंक है उसके दिशा-निर्देशों की बराबर अवहेलना करते रहते हैं । इसकी तरफ ध्यान देना पड़ेगा क्योंकि विदेशी बैंकों का आचरण ऐसा रहता है कि वह किसी भी उत्पादक कार्य के लिये ऋण नहीं देते हैं ; लोगों को विलासिता की चीजें खरीदने के लिये आमंत्रित करते हैं कि टी०वी० ले जाइये, फ्रिज से जाइये। अगर कोई उद्योग खोलना चाहता है तो उनके दरवाजे बन्द हैं । तो यह केवल विलासिता को बढ़ावा दे रहे हैं । इस पर आपको प्रतिबंध लगाना पड़ेगा ।

उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं बहुत संक्षेप में यह बात कहना चाहती हूं कि अनुसूचित जाति, अनुसूचित जनजाति के लिये वित्त निगम जो केन्द्र में भी है और राज्यों में भी है लेकिन इनको जो पैसा दिया जाता है, बहुत सी राज्य सरकारें उस पैसे को उनको हस्तांतरित नहीं करती हैं जिसके कारण अनुसूचित जाति के बेरोजगार नौजवान जो उद्योग लगाना चाहते हैं या अपना व्यवसाय आरम्भ करना चाहते हैं, वह भटकते रहते हैं । उनको समय पर पैसा नहीं मिल पाता है । मैं उदाहरण के लिये कहना चाहती हूं कि उत्तर प्रदेश में जो पिछली सरकार थी, उन्होंने अनुसूचित जाति और अनुसूचित जनजाति वित्त निगम का पैसा दिया ही नहीं (व्यवधान) यह बात सच है । पिछली सरकार के बारे में मालूम पड़ा कि केन्द्र ने जो पैसा दिया था लेकिन राज्य सरकार ने उस पैसे को हस्तांतरित नहीं किया । (व्यवधान) महोदय, मैं वर्तमान सरकार की ही बात कर रही हूं । वर्तमान को सीखना पड़ेगा, पिछली गलतियों से हम को सबक लेना पड़ेगा । मैं किसी पर आरोप-प्रत्यारोप नहीं लगाती लेकिन कमियों और गलतियों को सुधारने का आग्रह करूंगी । अम्बेदकर विश्वविद्यालय लखनऊ में हमारे स्वर्गीय प्रातः स्मरणीय श्री राजीव गांधी ने इसकी आधारशिला रखी थी । यह एक बहुत बड़ी उपलब्धि थी हम लोगों के लिये । मैं समझती हूं कि उसके संबंध में राज्य सरकार ने कोई काम नहीं किया । इतने वर्षों से वह पेंडिंग पड़ा हुआ है । बहुत लोगों ने लिखा, सांसदों ने लिखा, खुद मैंने भी इसके लिये प्रयास किया । हमारी सरकार ने उसको अधिग्रहीत किया और उसको केन्द्रीय विश्वविद्यालय का दर्जा दिया । अभी क्या है कि राज्य सरकार तो अपनी जिम्मेदारी से हाथ झाड़ बैठी थी, यह कह दिया कि हमारा इससे कोई लेना देना नहीं

है, कोई ताल्लुक नहीं है। अब इसको केन्द्रीय सरकार संभाले। मैं यह कहना चाहूंगी कि यह इतना अच्छा प्रोजेक्ट है, इसके लिये अधिक राशि देकर इसको आगे बढ़ाना चाहिये।

मान्यवर, एक्साइज डयूटी के बारे में मैं यह कहना चाहती हूं कि छोटे छोटे कारीगरों पर उत्पाद कर लगाया गया है, जुते बनाने वालों पर उत्पाद कर लगाया गया है, जिसके कारण आगरा में बड़ा जबरदस्त आंदोलन भी हुआ था और दो दिन यहां पर जूता बनाने वालों की हड़ताल भी हुई थी। जब राज्य सरकार की तरफ से सेल्स टेक्ट माफ है तो केन्द्रीय सरकार का हाथ से बनाई जाने वाली चीजों पर कम से कम उत्पाद कर माफ कर दिया जाना चाहिये। यह बहुत बड़ा जन-उपयोगी कार्य होगा।

मैं आगरा के बारे में कहना चाहती हूं। आगरा के ताजमहल को प्रदूषण से बचाने के लिये वहां पर कोयले पर आधारित उद्योगों पर प्रतिबंध लगा हुआ है। जो पहले उद्योग लगे हुये थे, उनको भी बन्द कर दिया गया। यह माननीय सर्वोच्च न्यायालय के आदेश से हुआ है। लेकिन आप इतना कर सकते हैं कि उसकी जगह पर अन्य उद्योगों को इलेक्ट्रोनिक उद्योगों को लगाने के लिये उनको प्रोत्साहन दें। यह मैं कहना चाहती हूं। दूसरा, वहां जो पम्पिंग सेट, जेनरेटर सेट, छोटे छोटे पावर जेनरेटर सेट हैं, उन पर एक्साइज डयूटी जो बढ़ाई गई है, उसको कम कर देना चाहिये। यह सेट छोटे छोटे उद्योग-धंधे वाले ही इस्तेमाल करते हैं।

मान्यवर, अब मैं अन्त में अपनी बात को समाप्त करते हुये यह कहना चाहूंगी कि उदारीकरण की नीति के तहत माननीय वित्त मंत्री जी इस बात का ध्यान रखे कि आज बैंक वाले यह कहते हैं कि हमारे पास यह निर्देश है कि कोई भी अगर ऋण लेने के लिए आता है किसी प्रोजेक्ट के लिये तो यह बात हम विशेष तौर पर देखते हैं कि ऐसे लोगों को हम ऋण देंगे जो वापिस करने की क्षमता रखते हों। लेकिन वापस करने की क्षमता रखने वालों की पहचान क्या है, परिभाषा क्या है। यह मालूम ही नहीं है। उसके लिये कोई दिशा निर्देश नहीं है। बैंक वाले मनमानी करते हैं और खास करके अनुसूचित जाति और जनजाति के लोग जब जाते हैं तो उनको इस श्रेणी में कहते हैं कि ये देने लायक नहीं है। इसलिये हम उनको ऋण नहीं देते हैं। इसलिये यह बात है कि हमारी जो नीतियां हैं उनका दुरुपयोग निरंकुश प्रशासनिक तौर पर न हो सके इस बात पर मंत्री जी को ध्यान देना पड़ेगा।

यह बजट वास्तव में बहुत अच्छा बजट है। आंकड़े तो हल दे दिये हैं, बता दिये हैं। इनके लिये मैं माननीय मंत्री जी को बधाई देना चाहती हूं, धन्यवाद देना चाहती हूं और अपने साथियों का भी याद दिलाना चाहती हूं कि जो बजट की वास्विकता है, जो अच्छाइयां हैं उनको जरूर ध्यान में रखें। यह बात कहते हुये क्योंकि समय बहुत कम है मैं अपनी बात समाप्त करती हूं। बहुत-बहुत शुक्रिया आपने समय दिया।

श्री भूपेन्द्र सिंह मान (नाम निर्देशित): श्रीमन्, यह जो डिफिसिट बजट दिया गया है, घाटे का बजट होते हुए भी इसमें से जो खर्चे हैं इनमें कमी करने के बारे में कुछ नहीं किया गया है। घाटे का बजट है। नौकरदारों का बोझ जिस बजट पर 65 प्रतिशत हो वह बजट कब तक ठीक तरह से चल सकता है। इस बजट में नौकरदारों का बोझ जो पब्लिक के कंधे पर पड़ा हुआ है उसे घटाने के बारे में मंत्री जी कुछ नहीं कर पाये हैं। यह बजट जो विधान के तहत दिया गया है और विधान की ही धारा, आर्टिकल 14 है जिसमें कहा गया है कि हर एक को इक्विलटी बिफोर ला होगी और यहां खेती की लूट की जा रही है। मैं जो देख रहा हूं वह मैं कह रहा हूं कि इस देश में निगेटिव सब्सिडी चल रही है खेती के ऊपर। अब मुझे

]श्री भूपेन्द्र सिंह मान]

अच्छा लगता है जब यह देश मान रहा है कि वाकई निगेटिव सब्सिडी चल रही है । वह भी इतनी । हैरानी की बात है कि निगेटिव सब्सिडी इस देश में जो इंकम टैक्स देने वाले लोग हैं उनसे कहीं ज्यादा उनसे टैक्स लिया जा रहा है जिन पर अहसान जतवाया जा रहा है कि आप टैक्स नहीं देते हो आपको सब्सिडी दी जाती है, आपसे इंकम टैक्स नहीं लेते हैं, आप पर मेहरबानियां करते हैं जबकि उनको इतना टैक्स दना पड़ रहा है यह अभी "गैट" में डिस-क्लोजर हुआ है । अपनी ही सरकार ने हमसे तो नहीं बताया लेकिन "गैट" के सामने जाकर उसको इविडेंस देनी पड़ी कि हां हम अपने ही किसान को लूटने की हद तक सब्सिडी के नाम पर उससे टैक्स वसूल कर रहे हैं । यह कितना है ? उसको कम करने के बारे में कुछ नहीं किया गया है, कोई कदम नहीं उठाया गया है, और वह है कितना इस देश को, सारी सभा को इसके बारे में चिन्ता करनी चाहिये कि कितना है ।

अभी, 24,442 करोड़ की निगेटिव सब्सिडी है 17 खेती की वस्तुओं पर । उनकी वैल्यू है 34 हजार करोड़ । 34 हजार करोड़ की वैल्यू की 17 खेती की वस्तुएं जो इस देश में पैदा होती है उनके ऊपर 24 हजार करोड़ रुपये का टैक्स है । जिसको निगेटिव सब्सिडी कहा जाता है हां, यह सरकार यह कहती है कि हम किसानों को सब्सिडी दे रहे हैं । ठीक है क्या-क्या सब्सिडी दे रहे हैं ? फर्टिलाइजर में कहते कि सब्सिडी दे रहे हैं, बिजली में कहते हैं कि सब्सिडी दे रहे हैं, इन्सेक्टिसाइड्स में कहते हैं कि सब्सिडी दे रहे हैं और क्या क्या कहते हैं कि सब्सिडी दे रहे हैं । ठीक है । लेकिन वह है कितनी ? 4581 करोड़ की सब्सिडी किसान वर्ग को देकर अगर उसमें से निकाल दें तो 19,861 करोड़ अब भी किसान टैक्स के रूप में दे रहा है निगेटिव सब्सिडी... (व्यवधान)

श्री वीरेन जे० शाह: निगेटिव सब्सिडी किसे कहते हैं, बताइये जरा ।

श्री भूपेन्द्र सिंह मान : निगेटिव सब्सिडी जो किसान को मंडी में मिल सकता है, जो किसान को मंडी में नहीं मिलने दिया जाता है, उसमें जो गैप है, वह निगेटिव सब्सिडी है । किसान को बंदिशें लगाकर जो रोका जाता है । मान लो किसान अगर मंडी में बेचे उसको यह मिलता, उसको रुकावट लगाकर जो किया जाता है, तो उसको यह मिलता है, यह जो गैप है वह निगेटिव सब्सिडी है । यह उसके हक के उसके हित के खिलाफ होता है, जो रूकावट है। तो इसके बारे में एक और बात कहना चाहूंगा खास तौर पर वित्त मंत्री जी से कि आपने नान प्रोडक्ट्स स्पे-सेफिक सब-सिडीज को बताया है कि हम यह 4,581 करोड़ देते हैं । उसमें कितनी इनएफीशिएंसी है, कितनी करप्शन है, कितनी लिथारजी है और उसमें भी जो आप मानते हैं कि वह सबसिडी भी वास्तव में उस इंडस्ट्री को जा रही है, चाहे तो बिजली की इंडस्ट्री को जा रही है जो बिजली बनाता है, चाहे वह फर्टिलाइजर की इंडस्ट्री को जाता है जो फर्टिलाइजर बनाता है तो वह सबसिडी वास्तव में फार्मर को नहीं आ रही है यह आप मानते हैं । लेकिन उसके साथ-साथ जो नान प्रोडक्ट्स स्पेसेफिक आइटम्ज जो किसान महंगे दाम पर खरीद रहा है उसके बारे में आपने कुछ नहीं कहा । डीजल वह महंगा ल रहा है, मशीनरी महंगी ले रहा है इन्सक्टीसाइड्स महंगे ले रहा है, फर्टि-लाइजर महंगे ले रहा है दे आर आल नेगेटिव नान-प्रोडक्ट सबसिडी, उसके बारे में यह बताने की जरूरत है और अगर इसको देख लें तो यह कहीं और ज्यादा होता है । इसकी परसेंटेज अगर देखें तो यह 70 प्रतिशत किसान के ऊपर जो टैक्स है नेगेटिव सब सिडी का वह और कोई किसान बर्दाश्त कर सकता है कैसे आज देश में इंकम टैक्स देने वला ज्यादा से ज्यादा कितना देता है नैट इंकम पर 50 हजार की छूट है और किसान को तो दस रुपये की भी वस्तु अगर मार्केट में वह बेचता है उसकी टर्न ओवर पर 70 प्रतिशत यहां जो लिया जाता है यह बेइंसाफी है । इसके बारे में इस बजट में कुछ नहीं कहा

गया कि उसको कम करने के संबंध में हम क्या करेंगे । इस संबंध में मैं अगर यह कहूं तो उचित ही होगा ।

"एक चाक हो तो सी लूं गिरेगां अपना,
जालिम ने फाड़ डाला है तार-तार करके ।"

तो यह है जो हमारे साथ हो रहा है । गांधी जी ने कहा था कि गरीब अपने आप संभल जायेगा, लेकिन गरीब के ऊपर से उसकी छाती पर से आप उठ जायें । आप गरीब का रोना रोते हैं, मगरमच्छ के आंसू बहाते हैं और कहते हैं कि गरीब के लिये हम कुछ कर रहे हैं, गरीब के लिये हम सभी बजट बनाते हैं, लेकिन गरीब की छाती पर से उठने को तैयार नहीं हैं । गरीब के ऊपर इतना बोझा डाले जा रहे हैं और यह उसको बताना भी नहीं चाहते । विधान में यह कहा है कि ऐसे धोखा किया जाय उसके साथ जो बिल्कुल सीधा-सादा काम करने वाला है, गांव में बैठा हुआ है उसके साथ यह अन्याय है धोखा करना, उसको यह कहना कि आपको सबसिडी दी जाती है जबकि वास्तव में उसको टैक्स लगा हुआ है बहुत ज्यादा, यह कहना चाहिये सरकार को यह सरे आम एलान करना चाहिये कि हम किसान से इस दुनिया में सब से बड़ा टैक्स देने वाला जो है वह इस देश का किसान है उसी समय इस देश में जो इंडस्ट्री है वह सबसे बड़ी प्रोटेक्टेड इंडस्ट्री है ।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY): You have to conclude now.

श्री भूपेन्द्र सिंह माल : मैं खत्म कर रहा हूं, सर । जिस इंडस्ट्री को जो इतनी बड़ी प्रोटेक्शन हो कि दुनिया में सबसे बड़ी प्रोटेक्टेड इंडस्ट्री वह हो और वह हमें इस देश का रा-मैटीरियल सिर्फ किसान का कच्चा माल लूट-लूट के अपने आप को बड़ी कह कर बनी हो उसके बारे में कुछ नहीं कहा गया कि वह लूट कैसे किसान की बन्द करवाई जायेगी । एक आइटम कह कर मैं आपसे क्षमा चहूगा बंद कर दूंगा वह यह कि एक ही मिसाल कपास, अगर मंडी में, मंडी का भाव यह आज का नहीं है, यह कई सरकारें उसके बाद 1986 से कई सरकारें आई हैं, कई गई हैं, सभी के होते हुये यह नेगेटिव सबसिडी चलती रही है । उस समय के 1986–89 के तीन सालों में कपास का मंडी का भाव 17,333 रुपये प्रति टन था । यह सरकार मानती है कि हमने किसान से 5,633 रुपये में लूटा किसान को यह देने पर मजबूर किया 5,633 रूपये में तो क्या नुकसान किया किसान का 11 हजार 7 सौ रुपया प्रति टन, यह 207 पर्सेंट यह टैक्स किसान से नेगेटिव सब सिडी का लना यह अन्याय है और यह इसको बन्द करना चाहिये । यह धोखाधड़ी का बजट नहीं आना चाहिये यह किसान को स्पष्ट तौर पर इस देश को बताना चाहिए कि हम क्या कर रहे हैं । छिपाकर रखी हुई बातें न तो वैधानिक हैं, न नैतिक हैं, न असली है, न देश के हित में हैं, देश आगे नहीं बढ़ सकता उतनी देर तक जितनी देर तक आप यह कहते हो कि हम बाहर के मटि-नेशनल को नहीं आने देंगे । वह देश को खा जायेंगे । और यहां जो बैठे हुये हैं मल्टी-नेशनल्स के टूल्स, वह यह कहते हैं कि सिर्फ हमने लूटना है देश वालों को और हम किसी को नहीं लूटने देंगे । जितनी देर तक यहां वाले यह सोच बन्द नहीं करते, उतनी देर तक यह देश तरक्की नहीं कर सकता । मान्यवर, यह जो बजट इस वक्त दिया गया है, इसमें जो दिशा होनी चाहिये थी किसान को बचाने की, किसान की लूट बन्द करने की, वह दिशा इस बजट में नजर नहीं आती जबकि इस दिशा को बढ़ावा मिलना चाहिये था ।

मान्यवर, मैं इस बजट का जोर से विरोध करता हूं । मुझे कहना तो बहुत कुछ है, लेकिन क्या कहूं समय की कमी है । आखिर में एक बात और कहना चाहूंगा कि यह वह देश है जिस देश में डा० इकबाल ने यह कहा था कि,

"सारे जहां से अच्छा, हिन्दुस्तां हमारा ।"

और उन्होंने ही यह कहा था कि,

'जिस खेत से दहकान को मयस्सर नहीं रोटी, उस खेत के हर खोशाए गंदुम को जला दो ।"

तो यह वही देश है और जितनी देर तक इस देश में न्याय नहीं होगा उतनी देर तक देश में तरक्की नहीं हो सकती । इसलिये आपसी लूट बन्द होनी चाहिये एक-दूसरे के कंधे पर चढ़ना बन्द होना चाहिये । इन्हीं शब्दों के साथ मैं अपनी बात खत्म करता हूं । धन्यवाद ।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY): Dr. Jichkar. You have given me only five minutes, I will call the Finance Minister. (Interruptions). Your name was called but you were not there.

DR. SHRIKANT RAMCHANDRA JICHKAR (Maharashtra): Sir, since you have given me only five minutes, I will directly come to the point and make only one point. I wanted to congratulate the hon. Finance Minister on many points, but because of the paucity of time I will pass on that congratulatory note to the hon. Finance Minister for his record.

Sir, we have been hearing criticism that deficit financing leads to inflation. On 28th of February when the Budget was laid, the Finance Secretary went on record to say on television that deficit financing was not going to lead to inflation. Sir, I entirely agree with him because when we talk of teficit financing and inflation, the Finance Minister himself gave the figures how inflation had come down from 17 per cent to half the figure. I tried to carve a graph of deficit financing in the last 40 years and tried to co-relate it with the prices. In the realm of statistics there is no significant co-relation. All this deficit financing came from the time of Keynes. When Lord Keynes write the preact to the French edition of 1936 book on General Theory, he himself said that "deficit finance is not inflationary till and until full employment is achieved in the economy. So, I would like to be enlightened on this. We know that the monopolies administer prices in the market. Once we admit that the monopolies administer prices in the market, we admit that these prices are snsulated from demand and supply and from the money that is circulated in the market. Unless we have impirical evidence of competitive market prices and the quantity of money in circulation, it would be wrong to assert any conclusion as regards the co-relation between deficit financing and inflation. Sir, I believe that such an exercise is impossible in India because we do not have statistics of commodity prices in the real competitive market. Our data of wholesale price index includes elements of administered prices also. Therefore, such an exercise cannot be done. Then how do people go on saying that deficit financing leads to inflation? I am a student of this. I would like the hon. Finance Minister to enlighten us on this and give us a studied note on this, whether deficit financing is really going to lead to inflation or not, because if we try to corelate the figures, they do not co-relate. Sir, it is very rare in the history of nations that any democratic nation gets an economist as Finance Minister, but we have been lucky that we have a great economist as our Finance Minister. Although I am young in age and I do not have so much experience to make a comparison, I am comparing Dr. Manmohan Singh with Hugh Dalton who was a great economist and a great professor of Economics.

5.00 p.m.

(The Deputy Chairman in Chair) And I compare Dr. Manmohan Singh with Hugh Dalton in three or four respects. Both can be compared in three or four respects, except one, and that is welcome. Madam, only four minutes are over. In one minute I will be concluding.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I have got the clock with me.

DR. SHRIKANT RAMCHANDRA JICHKAR: Hugh Dalton was an economist and Dr. Manmohan Singh is an economist. Hugh Dalton was a specialist in public finance and here we have Dr. Manmohan Singh who is a great specialist in public finance. Both Hugh Dalton and Dr. Manmohan Singh enjoyed the confidence of the nation and both had

resigned as Finance Ministers. Hugh Dalton resigned as Finance Minister and Dr. Manmohan Singh also resigned as Finance Minister. The difference is only on one account. Why did Hugh Dalton resign?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I thought, why did he take back his resignation?

DR. SHRIKANT RAMCHANDRA JICHKAR: In that case the nation was not behind Hugh Dalton, that his resignation should not be accepted. Here the entire nation was behind Dr. Manmohan Singh, that his resignation should not be accepted.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Won't you sit down? That would be better.

DR. SHRIKANT RAMCHANDRA JICHKAR: What had happened just on the eve of the presentation of his budget was, Hugh Dalton was so relaxed, like our own Finance Minister, that he went with his friend to a pub. And while leaving the pub, his friend offered a cigarette to Hugh Dalton. While taking the cigarette, Hugh Dalton said, "Let me have the last puff." His friend was a journalist and he flashed in the next day's newspapers that there was going to be an increase in the cost of cigarettes, and Hugh Dalton had to resign.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now, will you please keep quiet?

DR. SHRIKANT RAMCHANDRA JICHKAR: Now, the entire nation was behind Dr. Manmohan Singh on this account and, therefore, I congratulate him for all this. He is the first person who has not tried to get into the labels of monetary policy, fiscal policy, this and that. He has set his own standards. He has made a fine synthesis of monetary policies and fiscal policies in this budget, and he has not got himself entrapped in the labels of economic terms and, therefore, he deserves our congratulations. He has set new standards for this nation.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now, will you please sit down?

DR. SHRIKANT RAMCHANDRA JICHKAR: It is said in the Bhagavadgita, 15th chapter:

सयत् प्रमाण कुरूते लोकस्त नुपर्तते ।

They set the standards and others follow it.

Dr. Manmohan Singh has set the standards of economics in this country and, therefore, he deserves the highest commendation and congratulations.

Madam, thank you. I took six minutes and 40 seconds.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I am sorry, your watch is wrong. Manmohan Singhji, the reply.

...*(Interruptions)*...

THE MINISTER OF FINANCE (SHRI MANMOHAN SINGH): Madam, I have heard, with great interest,, at least some of the speeches that have been made in this august House. I have tried to study the others, whic h I was not able to listen because of my preoccupations elsewhere.

Madam, I would like to compliment all the hon. Members who have taken part in the debate, and I honestly feel flattered by the seriousness which has characterized this debate. There have been some excellent speeches from both sides of the House, and I compliment Dr. Murli Manohar Joshi, my esteemed friend, Dr. Ashok Mitra, Mr. Jaipal Reddy, Mr. Jagesh Desai, Mr. Singla, and the new Member, Mr. Sanjay Dalmia, and many others who have analysed this budget from various angles. All of them have the good of this country at heart, and I believe it augurs well for the future of democracy in our country that there should be a sincere and honest debate about where this country wants to go and how we are going to get to that particular destination, the great potential that hitherto has not been

[Shri Man Mohan Singh]

fully exploited, to great expectation and the great aspiration that our people had from development, but somehow they have not been realised.

As I look upon the history of this country during the last 40 to 50 years, I find there had been two overriding constraints which have not allowed the immense potential of this country to express itself in the form of high rates of growth, which, in turn, coupled with other associated policies, would have led to faster and more meaningful attack on poverty. These have been shortage of foreign exchange and the availability of food. We have over the years done reasonably well in dealing with the problems of food shortages, but not enough and there has been a lot of unexploited potential in agriculture. But somehow for all these 40 to 50 years of India's independence, particularly since 1947, there has been this chronic shortage of foreign exchange and it has in turn, led to an economic control mechanism which has led to a lot of inefficiency and corruption. Over the period of time it has led to a system which has become a major constraint on the utilisation of vast human and physical resources that this country has. That is why we have had stalwarts who presided over the economic destinies of this country. Until 1980, the average growth rate of this country did not exceed 3.5 per cent. The proportion of people below the poverty line did not fall below 50 per cent. Because of this constraint of foreign exchange, we devised a system which discriminated massively against exports, which placed a massive premium on inefficiency. Howsoever inefficient an Indian producer was, we felt that he was obliged to be protected. The result was that in our system the capital-output ratio rose year after year. This nation started by saving less than 10 per cent of its National Income. It saved by the 70s about 22 to 24 per cent. Yet our growth rate did not improve because of these built in inefficiences, because of these control mechanisms, which might have served their purpose when it all began. But over the period it became dysjunctional. In the name of import-substitution we tried to regulate everything. In the process we became an economy which was over-regulated and under-governed. Black-markets flourished at home. And when it came to marketing of foreign exchange, smugglers found this sort of a system a paradise. If you do not tackle the shortage of foreign exchange, I do not believe this country can really sustain a high rate of growth. That moment came in the 80s when the foreign exchange constraint looked less of a burden partly because of fortuitous circumstances, partly because of the efforts that we made to increase domestic oil production, but in the 80s the foreign exchange constraint became less of a constraint and we found the growth rate of the economy good. We also found that despite differences about the statistics of people below the poverty line, the proportion of people below the poverty line declined in the 80s. Therefore, I submit to this august House, if we are going to see that this country grow at a faster pace, and it must grow fast, to solve the chronic problems of poverty, massive unemployment, underemployment, social indignities, which our people suffer in daily life, we do need to grow faster than what we have done. Growth by itself is not enough. As Prime Minister rightly says, "Growth, while it is essential, is not a sufficient condition that it will benefit everybody." Therefore, we need supplementary measures, purposeful interventions to raise the growth potentialities of those who are at the lowest rung of the ladder, through education, through health care, through anti-poverty programme to empower the disadvantaged groups of our people to help themselves, to realise their full potentials. I submit to you, Madam, that this can become a reality only if we somehow manage to bond this foreign exchange constraint. In the name of foreign exchange constraint, the approach that has been adopted thus far—and the same approach, my esteemed friend, Dr. Mitra, wanted to say to this House—despite its having proved to be a chronic failure and a chronic disaster, was, you restricted imports, you pursued a path of indiscriminate import-cum-ex-

port compression, you gave indefinite protection to Indian industry, howsoever inefficient it may be. And what has been the consequence? Our people ask, what was the gap between rural India and urban India at the time of Independence? The ratio between the rural wages and the urban wages was 1:1. Today, it is 1:-4. It is this excessive indiscriminate protection of Indian industry which is the biggest single factor for these widening rural and urban disparities. When we criticise the excessive protection,... (Interruption)... I am not yielding. I do not want interruptions, Madam. If you do not do anything to reduce this excessive protection, you cannot have an efficient industrial structure. Some people say, "All countries have protected. All countries have regulated. Korea has done this. Why are you saying that we should not regulated?" I am not saying that the State has no role in the management of economy. The question is: What is a purposeful intervention? The Koreans had a massive State intervention, but the Korean State intervention was not more purposeful. Right in the beginning, they encouraged industries which met the test of international competitiveness. When they found that those industries did not come up to their own, they immediately set in motion a process to see that these industries must go out of existence. But in this country we had an approach, "Once you set up an industry, regardless of whether it performed or not, you must go on giving it more and more protection. And at the end of it you had protection rates of 300 per cent, 400 per cent! And whenever our negotiators went abroad and said, "Our tariff rates are 300 per cent. 400 per cent," most people said, "These people must be coming from Mars." Because most of the countries, over a period of time, including the developing countries of South East Asia and East Asia, have not approached. Now, I do want to submit; an efficient economic structure cannot emerge without a reform of this tariff structure; by doing away gradually; in a manner which would not hurt Indian industry; with this excessive protection which, in my opinion, has been the root-cause of growing inequalities in income and wealth, growing disparities in the rural and urban standards... (*Interruptions*)...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Members had their time and they had put their points every clearly. Now the Minister wants to put his points. Please have patience to listen because, you cannot be so interested; perhaps, others are.

SHRI MANMOHAN SINGH: And, therefore, if we take self-reliance seriously, we need a massive increase in our exports. We are a country well-endowed with regard to natural resources but I submit to this august House that when it comes to measurement of India's natural resources on a per capita basis, we are not a well-endowed nation. And I wish, if India has an ambition, then it must have the ambition of growing at seven, eight, nine or ten per cent. Its import needs under any conceivable strategy of development will increase. How are you going to finance those things? For the last 44 years we talked of self-reliance. But every year the Finance Secretary and the Finance Minister of India have gone abroad and said, "We are a poor country. Please give us aid. Please give us aid on concessional terms." Now, even if you want to continue in that path, I must tell the House that if donors are fed up, nobody wants, I think, to give money, throw away their money, in the belief that it will help a country like India. There is not much more selfishness in the world. But it is also very degrading. Therefore, if this country takes the task of self-reliance seriously, then it has no other option but to have an economic structure which enables the gap between imports and exports to be filled and that is possible under the Indian condition only through a massive increase in exports. If you want a massive increase in exports your industry has to be efficient, your agriculture has to be efficient and that is the broad strategy that we have consistently tried to pursue in the course of these

[Shri Manmohan Singh]

31 months that our Government have been in power. What have we achieved? When I became the Finance Minister the first public statement that I made was that our country was in such a deep crisis that it would take us a minimum period of three years to see the first beneficial results of what we were doing. I must confess to you, Madam, that I have been very pleasantly surprised that this transition period has turned out to be much shorter. It has turned out to be less painful and I make a claim here—my friend Dr. Ashok Mitra is a very distinguished economist—that today you show me in the Third World one country which got into the mess of the type we were in in June 1991 and managed to come out of that mess with the least possible task in terms of loss of output, in terms of increase in unemployment or even in terms of inflation. Look at the experience of Latin America. Mexico is advertised as a successful case. But the *per capita* income in Mexico in 1991 was still lower than in 1982. It took Mexico seven or eight years despite sensible policies to get out of that crisis. Other countries' experience has been much more difficult. But in this country somehow we have succeeded. Not in solving all the problems, but at least the foreign exchange constraint has been bent. I venture to think that if we persevere with what we have been doing and that, if in the next five or six years foreign exchange does not remain as binding a constraint on India's development as it has been in the last forty years of foreign dependences. You will see the flowering of India's creativity. You will see the Indian enterprises showing to the rest of the world that we are second to none and in the process a new India will emerge, a new industrial revolution will take roots in our country. Dr. Mitra said that I had no vision. This is the vision that the Prime Minister set before our country when our Government took office. Let me say that if this policy succeeds, I am sure, there will be the fastest reduction in the proportion of people living below the poverty line. Now, in this House several hon. Members have criticised me saying that I am not spending more on this area and that area. I agree. If I had the leverage, I would have liked to spend more on anti-poverty programme, I would have liked to strengthen agricultural research, I would have liked to strengthen, the nation's scientific and R & D structure, I would have spent a lot more money on education, which we will do regardless of other constraints. It is a shame that after 45 years of our independence we have not been able to realise the constitutional imperative of our children having access to free elementary education. Even after 46 years of Independence, out of 1000 children born in this country, 80 children die before they reach even the age of one year. These are the tasks which cannot be taken care-of by the market forces. These are the tasks which the Indian State must attend to. There is a tremendous environmental degradation today. The degradation of India's land and water resources today threatens the livelihood of millions of small and marginal farmers all over the country. The market forces cannot take care of that. The market forces cannot take care of the needs of those who are on the edge of subsistence. After all, the market serves those only who are part of the market system. Madam, millions of people who live on the edge of subsistence, are outside the market system. So, we need a more direct strategy to reach out to them. But how can we reach out to them? If simultaneously you ask me to finance inefficient industries and to put a lot of money into the loss—making public sector undertakings, I cannot do all these things together. Therefore, the Prime Minister said, "The time has come to return to the basics." There are basic needs of our people which have not been met, for no fault of anyone but because of the circumstances that I mentioned; that our priority must be to restructure our economic control mechanism: that over a period of time, gradually, we shift Government's financial resources and Government's administrative resources from policing of a small sector which generates less than 25 per cent of India's GNP to attend to the basic tasks of rural development, poverty removal, providing decent health care, providing decent elementary education to

all our children. So, this is the vision. This is the goal that our Government, our Prime Minister, has set before us. Now, you will ask me, 'What have you done in this Budget?' In this Budget, if you look at the allocations for poverty removal...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: There are some strepsils for you from the Leader of the Opposition.

DR. MANMOHAN SINGH: Madam, Dr. Murli Manohar Joshi and other colleagues from the Opposition said that this Budget has nothing for the poor. The problems of poverty in India are so intractable that they cannot be removed by one, two or three Budgets. But we have a consistant strategy. As I said, if we gradually reduce the protection, it will directly benefit our consumers and it will gradually reduce the discrimination against agriculture, against rural India which is built into this exploitative pattern of over-production of a small sector of our economy. So, that is a part of the process of poverty reduction. That is a part of the process of reducing inequalities of income and wealth. But we know that is going to be a long-term process. Therefore, in the meantime we need to strengthen the anti-poverty programmes. Two years ago, we were spending around Rs. 3,000 crores on the programmes of the Department of Rural Development. In two years' time, we have raised that provision to over Rs. 7,000 crores. We have devised new instrumentalities to cater to the needs of the poor in 1,750 blocks which contain the hard core of the poverty in our country. It is our ambition. It is our desire that this system of assured employment for a minimum period of 100 days or more, as we go along, should become a nation-wide commitment. But it cannot happen overnight. There is constraint of resources. But that is the direction in which we are moving. We have increased the expenditure on education in the Central Plan by roughly 18 per cent. On health, we have increased it by 20 per cent. We are making determined efforts to control diseases like leprosy, blindness, AIDS etc. This is the broad vision and the broad strategy of getting the Government out of those activities where the Government activity is not proving productive. That is why we do not want to expand the public sector. We feel that this work can be done by other sectors. The time has come to divert the Government energy to meeting those unfulfilled needs which should have been met long ago, but which have not been met so far. My experience in the Government is that whether it is financial resources or it is administrative resources, the departments which have the greatest bearing on the future of this nation, the departments like education, departments like health, departments like social welfare and all those concerned with nation building activities have been starved of resources. They have never attracted the best of administrators also. The best of administrators have always wanted to go to the Ministry of Industry so that they can rub shoulders with industrialists. They wanted to go to the Ministry of Commerce because their one control order could decide the fate of powerful people and of industries, so that when they met them in the Gymkhana club, they could rub shoulders with them on an equal footing. The best of our civil servants wanted to go to the Ministries which had something to do with administering these controls. Our nation building activities and departments have been starved of resources because of our excessive pre-occupation with the so-called commanding heights. I will say with all respect that today, in the world, it is not steel which is at the commanding height of the economy. It is a declining activity. It is knowledge which is going to determine our nation's future and that knowledge-base we must build. There are vast gaps. How are you going to meet the challenges of the 21st Century if you have a working class which is half educated or uneducated? People talk of family planning. It is not simply a matter of spending more money on family planning. If our women are illeterate, you may spend as much money on family planning, you will not get to a situation where the "small family" norm gains voluntary acceptability. For all these things we need to have a different orientation and that is what we have been trying to do. This Budget is a part of that

[Shri Man Mohan Singh]

process. Madam, I have been criticised because I have not been able to live up to the promises that I made with regard to the control of fiscal deficit. I plead guilty to that charge. But I am very happy that today there is a unanimity in this House, near unanimity, that this nation cannot simply spend its way to prosperity and that we have, as a nation, to worry about this growing fiscal deficit, increasing Government indebtedness. About 2 1/2 years ago, when I launched my first Budget I was criticised for the very same thing by saying that I was an agent of the IMF. When I presented my Budget for 1992-93, I had the unique honour of all the major Leaders of the Opposition rising, before I could present my Budget and saying that I had sold this country's honour and secrets to the IMF. Today I am mighty, pleased when I find all shades of opinion, more so, our friends from the Left and the Janata Dal saying that fiscal discipline is a good thing I am mighty, pleased. I must say, the IMF is also very pleased that our Leaders of Opposition have become more fundish today, than the Fund itself. I have explained in my Budget speech what the compelling circumstances were Why the fiscal deficit got out of hand? I do not have to explain it again. Our friend, I think, Mr Viren Shah asked, what were the extraordinary circumstances?' I think he knows jolly well what those extraordinary circumstances were. I think the terrible things that happened in Ayodhya, its aftermath and the bomb blasts that took place in March shook our nation and destroyed the confidence among the investors, and the industrial production was, I think, a natural sufferer of that process—wittingly or unwittingly, a process of destabilising our country. And if you look at the industrial production the capital goods production, until 1992 the capital goods production was rising at the rate of about 7 to 8 per cent. But after the shocks of Ayodhya, after the shocks of the communal riots and after the shocks of these bomb blasts investors became fickle-minded and the result was that there was a big slump in the capital goods sector. The rest of the manufacturing sector has managed to grow at the rate o ebout 6 per cent. The second thing that happened was that since the mid-1980s, a large part of India's public sector enterprises—the Railways, the Telecom, the power sector that is, the National Thermal Power Corporation—used to go to the capital market for finance. But we had this unfortunate experience of the scam in which the access of the public sector enterprises to this capital market dried up. And, therefore, in 1993-94, these public sector units, namely, the Railways, the Telecom and the National Thermal Power Corporation, could not maintain their momentum. But that phase is happily over now. I think the Railways, as also other public sector enterprises, are back in the capital market. Soon the VSNL, one of the India's most successful companies, is going to launch a Euro-issue to raise about a billion dollars, If that billion dollars in the next three years, is used to modernise our telecom system, there will be the biggest ever boom in the telecom sector as regards supply of equipments.

Now these were the compelling reasons as to why the industries did not recover. When the industries do not recover, it naturally has its fallout on Excise, it has its fallout on Customs. Then, there were the compelling circumstances of increased expenditure. We have exercised a great restraint in increasing the defence expenditure. The former Finance Minister in the previous Government of Pakistan is a very dear friend of mine and we both said that it should be our endeavour that our two countries did not enter into an onslaught. Our Government, our Prime Minister took a conscious decision to restrain defence expenditure. But what has happened in the last few months is now well known to this country And I would not be worthy of being the Finance Minister of this country if I were to say, "No, I have an obligation to meet the fiscal deficit target and therefore I will not meet the legitimate needs of India's armed forces in the circumstance of the grave danger to the national security that our country faces." So, I had to increase by Rs 2320 crores for defence purposes Similarly, food subsidies got out of hand by Rs. 2200 crores Now, the Government is being criticised that it is scuttling the public distribution sys-

lem. If you criticise the Government for that, then you should have, at least, given me some credit for increasing the food subsidies by Rs. 2200 crores over what was provided in the Budget. This is not the instance of a heartless Government. The Prime Minister has always said, "we are committed to adjustment; we are committed to reforms, but to adjustment and structural change with a human face." And this commitment of ours to have a reformed programme with a human face is obvious from what we have been doing. In the same way, in fertilisers, we had to spend an additional amount of over Rs. 1500 crores, and I don't groudge that even if it meant that I look rather humble when I come before this House saying that I was not able to fulfil the target. I am happy that the farmers of this country got fertilisers at a relatively lower cost and, as a result, we have, today, a happy situation with roughly 23 million tonnes of foodgrains in our stocks. I have said in my Budget speech that there may be many things which we may like or we may not like. But one thing I always believe in is that when it comes to farmers, whenever you are in doubt, go by the advice of the farmous English poet, Oliver Goldsmith: "A bold peasantry, their country's pride. When once destroyed can never be supplied." Our Government will stand by our farmers, will strengthen in every possible way the interests of the farmers. And despite what Mannji said, the strategy that we are pursuing, if it is conststently followed, you will see a new agricultural revolution, a new wave of diversification of India's agriculture. Two years ago, nobody could imagine that this country would be exporting grapes worth Rs 100 crores. Yet that is exactly what happened. You will see a lot more innovativeness, a lot more creativity in India's agricultural sector. But one thing which I do want to say to our friends is that in a country where agriculture is by 70 per cent of our population, beyond a point, all this talk of increasing subsidisation of agriculture can be counter-productive. All over the world, agriculture has to provide resources to finance the industrialisation of the country. India is not in the same position as the United States is as the European Union is. There the farming population is 2 to 3 per cent of their population. Any nation can subsidise indifenitely a population which is 2 to 3 per cent of it stotal population. But no Government in India, I can assure you, whatever may be your political compulsion, can subsidise 70 per cent of the population. We have to evolve a new path in which agriculture has to provide surpluses. There surpluses do not have to take the form in which they will break the backs of the peasantry. I would like India's farmers to get remunerative prices. But, let those surpluses in the hands of the farmers be used to promote a pattern of efficient rural industrialisation. And that is why it is necessary, as we go along to remove some of the restrictions that restrict the farmers' freedom to invest in the agro-processing industry. We have removed some, but a lot more remains to be done. And this is the only way in which we will evolve a pattern of industrialisation, a balance between agriculture and industry which does not lead to the type of distortions which the Stalinist Russia gave rise to, which are consistent with what the Prime Minister has been saying, 'development with a human face becoming a reality'. So, this is what I have to say about this.

Now, about fiscal deficit, I would like to reiterate that what happened in 1993-94 cannot become a norm, and that it will be our earnest effort to bring back the system to control fiscal deficit because I do not believe that fiscal profligacy can bring about prosperity. It will accentuate inflation, it will give rise again to loss of confidence in India's currency, it will lead to a flight of capital. So, it is the solemn obligation of all sections of the House to help me, to help the Government to bring the system back to a more balanced path. Now, yet me say this. People have been saying, Dr. Mitra and other colleagues have said, "Well, now that you have reduced fiscal deficit, it is going to lead to 20 per cent rate of inflation." I have on several occasions appealed to the hon. Members of this House as well as the other House that great weight is attached to what hon. Members say. We are in some wage opnion-makers. And if a general feeling gets round in

[Dr. Manmohan Singh]

this country that prices are going to rise the way Dr. Mitra, with all his vast knowledge and experience, predicts, I can assure you that these are self-fulfilling exercises. If every Indian on an average starts storing an additional half a kilogram of sugar, half a kilogram of vegetable oils, that alone can play havoc with this system. So, I think, as a nation, if you want to control inflation, let us not give rise to a psychology of scarcity, a psychology of encouraging hoarding. For the rest, I feel confident that notwithstanding the fiscal deficit—I am not happy about it—we will bring it back but there is no such danger of going the way our economy was going in 1990-91. The year 1994-95 is not 1990-91. At that time we had no food stocks. At that time we had no foreign exchange. Today, we have a comfortable foreign exchange. We have a record amount of food stocks for the last several years. So we have reason to believe that we will be successful in controlling inflation. On this, our Government's commitment is to keep inflation constantly monitored and to bring back the prices to a more moderate level. There should be no doubt about this Commitment, and I am confident about it. But if responsible Members start scaring our country, I shudder, frankly speaking. If this psychology spreads, with the best of will, we shall not succeed. But today, we have enough instruments. There is today shortage of sugar and we have allowed sugar to come in under OGL. If there comes another occasion of shortage, we can bring through imports we can sell from the public sector food stocks. So, even if we have a drought as happened in 1987, because of good management, because of good stocks, despite the drought, the prices will be controlled. So, the nation should have the assurance that this Government has the will, has the resources and has the ability to keep prices under control.

A great deal of concern was expressed about the external debt situation. Both Dr. Mitra and Dr. Murli Manohar Joshi raised this issue. Let me say that I share their concern but not their assessment. Contrary to what they have said about our debt situation, it is not deteriorating. It is improving. In fact, I venture anybody to challenge it. This Government has arrested the deterioration in the debt situation. In 1990-91, when our friends from the Opposition were in power, a record amount of external debt of 8 billion dollars was piled up. In the next two years when our Government was in power, it increased at an average of only 3 billion dollars per annum. This includes the IMF borrowing. In fact, while we borrowed medium term from the IMF, we reduced our short-term debt. I had wide talks. When I become the Finance Minister. I inherited a horrendous condition where the State Bank had a massive amount of short-term debt which was being used finance the import of essential commodities because we had no capacity, otherwise, to finance it. I have today wiped out nearly the whole short-term debt. We have changed the structure of the debt. We have reduced the proportion of short-term debt: we of medium-term debt which is under medium-term debt which is under our greater control. In 1993-94, the increase in our external debt has been almost negligible; it is only 300 million in the first six months, and what is more, our reserves this year have increased by almost 8 bilion. Dr. Mitra prove that all this is borrowed money. I would like to tell him if he does not know it that we used to have balance of payment deficit on current account of 2 to 3 per cent. This year we would have nearly wiped it out and there is a good chance that we will end up with a small surplus, if not a balance in our current account. That is the record of this Government, not what the prophets of doom would like us to believe. I would like the hon. Members to compare our Government's performance with what happened in that one year of 1990-11. In 1990-91, our debt increased by 8 billion dollars and our reserves declined by 1.1 billion dollars despite borrowing from the IMF. In 1993-94 our debt has hardly increased at all. On the other hand, our reserves have increased by 8 billion dollars. Mr.

Mitra said that we would need 7 to 8 billion dollars per year to repay a debt of 30 billion dollars in the next three years. He knows very well that this is a distorted comparison. Our total debt service in 1993-94 is around 8.2 billion dollars. This consists of 3.3 billion dollars towards interest payments and 4.9 billion dollars towards principal repayment. The interest payments on our debt is part of the current account and is, more or less, covered by our invisible earnings and remittances. Here, I take this opportunity once again to congratulate our sisters and brothers from Kerala and other States who toil hard to make this possible for us to finance this.

SHRI MENTAY PADMANABHAM: Kerala and Hyderabad also.

SHRI MANMOHAN SINGH: The second part, the principal repayment of around 5 billion dollars per annum, does not have to be covered entirely by foreign investment. I repeat this. My good friend, Dr. Mitra, knows it very well. He knows that it is quite normal to cover principal repayment by fresh borrowings. In fact, if we cover all the principal repayment with fresh loans, it could easily pay our total outstanding, but would still remain constant. This is a totally misleading picture being given of our balance of payments and exaggerates the problem.

The real question, Madam, is whether our debt servicing ratio, i.e. the ratio of all debt payments to current earnings has improved or not. Here, I would like to take the House into confidence because the record is being challenged. A distorted picture is being presented. India's debt servicing ratio—Dr. Murli Manohar Joshi is not here: he implied to the contrary; I would like to tell him through his friends—was 31.9 per cent of current receipts in 1991-92. It dropped to 30.8 per cent in 1992-93 and is likely to be even lower in 1993-94.

Dr. Mitra had posed the problem—I have a great regard for him; he is a very dear friend of mine—deliberately, in a somewhat misleading way. I have said it. I repeat it. The basic aim of debt management—I am laying down the guidelines—in our country has to be to ensure that the current account deficit is maintained at a level where we will be able to finance it through a combination of net increase in debt and foreign investment which is prudent, which is manageable. We have stayed well within these limits. I would like to assure the country that prudence, constant vigilance, in this area would be the watchword for us. The current account deficit which was 9.7 billion dollars in 1991 dropped to 4 billion dollars in 1992-93 and is close to balance, i.e. zero, in the current year.

Even if the deficit increases next year —it could, as the economy expands—we will have absolutely no difficulty in financing it wihout much increase in the total debt outstanding. I think I have explained the position on debt in great detail because a lot of misleading propaganda is being indulged in, that we are piling up debt which is not sustainable and that foreigners are pressurising us to borrow recklessly. This is far from the truth. The truth is quite to the contrary.

Now, coming to import duties...

SHRI VIREN J. SHAH: About the NRI deposits, would you like to enlighten us?

SHRI MANMOHAN SINGH: The increase in the reserves has been the result of all the transactions, including the NRI deposits I do not have to worry about NRI deposits when the aggregate position is so good. Let me say that much as I value this support that we get from the NRIs., it is a costly form of money. That is why I have been trying to phase out this costly borrowing. One year borrowing; we said that we would not accept deposits. Two years; we said we would not accept. We would only accept deposits of longer maturity because they are retail high-cost borrowing. Now, when we are in this position of debt, we will encourage our companies to pre-pay their debt which is high-cost. I think Mr. Chaturanan Mishra is not

[Shri Manmohan Singh]

here. Despite all the dislike that he has for the International Monetary Fund, he was very unhappy that I am returning money to the International Monetary Fund. (*Interruptions*) I do not understand this solicitude for the interest of the IMF coming from the CPI.

I have covered most of the points, but there is one point about the tax proposals that I would like to touch upon. Sir, the vision of the tax system...

AN HON. MEMBER: Madam, not Sir.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: He replies in the Lok Sabha. So, I think it is his habit.

SHRI MANMOHAN SINGH: What is the vision of the tax system that our Government has? I meet a large number of young people, small entrepreneurs. They come and tell me. 'We want to stay honest, but the system that does not permit us to stay honest". And my heart bleeds when I find that the old sianers cannot but be corrupt, but we are corrupting the minds of children. If you have confiscatory rates of taxation, there is no way in which we can have honesty in the private sector, honesty in the public sector. It takes two to corrupt. Private sector corrupts and the public sector accepts corruption. Therefore, I agree with Shri Viren Shah and I agree with Shri Jethmalani that we have these problems of corruption. Part of the problem is to reduce controls, as less discretionary as possible. The reform of the tax system is also an important part of that process of ensuring that at least the new generation of Indians will grow up to be honest. Therefore, whether it comes to direct taxes or indirect taxes, our goal is a moderate tax system, a least discretionary tax system, which does not give arbitrary powers to tax authorities and which does not create scope for massive litigation. Whatever you may say about what is called the Indian brand of socialism, there is one profession which has derived the maximum benefit out of this and that is the Indian legal profession. I do not think that is good for the resource allocation. All these resources which are going into the legal profession can be usefully diverted to more creative activity. Therefore, the process of reform of personal income tax I began two years ago; I have carried forward that process. In the process I have tried to meet the needs of the lower middle class, senior citizens. Eight million people will benefit by the exemption limit increase and I believe, this is a step in the right direction. I have carried forward the process of reform of the corporate taxes. It is sometimes considered that this is a bonanza for the private sector. A very large part of it, roughly 40 per cent of our corporate tax— if I am speaking from my memory—is paid by the private and the public sectors. I want to strengthen the hands of our management whether it is in the private sector or in the public sector, to meet the challenge of restructuring. They need resources. This is not encouraging their consumption, this is to encourage investment in the nation's future. I am, therefore, not at all ashamed of this thing.

Dr. Mitra mentioned that I am encouraging the consumption of consumer durables. Let me say that I have no regrets about that I have three daughters They all work hard. They are working people, and today you have a situation where if a middle class or a lower middle class family wants to remain honest, both husband and wife have to work. If at the end of the day you expect a working girl to come home and if she is denied of simple things, of having a small refrigerator at home or having some other amenities, I think their lives would become utterly miserable. I am proud that these luxuries which were so far a monopoly of the rich and the super rich would become increasingly available to middle class and lower middle class and people. This is not an attempt to encourage superfluous consumption. It is to lighten the burden of India's vital middle class and the lower middle class.

Madam, I believe I have covered... (*Interruptions*)...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please sit down. Let him finish.

SHRI MANMOHAN SINGH: Madam, several Members on the Opposition said that this budget is a recipe for stagflation. All of them said that I should increase expenditure. All of them were also worried about the fiscal deficit. Now, what is it that they expect me to do? How am I going to finance this extra expenditure? Some of them said that I should not have given these tax concessions. I have explained the rationale of tax concessions. They are essentially to revive Indian industries.

People say that India's capital goods industry is vital. I venture to think, what I have done for India's capital goods industry this single year, no previous Finance Minister has done. By extending the benefit of MODVAT credit, by imposing the countervailing import duties on all imported capital goods, I have provided a massive strength to India's capital goods industry. It will cost the exchequer. The implicit cost is Rs. 1,000 to 1,200 crores, but is is justified. It is a necessary investment in India's future, it is a necessary investment in making our country self-reliant.

Now, I was saying about this talk about stagflation. I really would be honest with this House. Considering that until 1979, with the best of will, with far superior brains guiding the destiny of this country, our average growth rate did not exceeded 3.5 per cent. If you do not tackle and bend the foreign exchange constraint, you are again facing that danger. There is no magic that I have which can say that you can simply grow out of thin air. More growth can come about, stagflation can be broken, if we take the task of structural reforms seriously.

What is the logic of these structural reforms? Structural reforms mean that you must get more output from your existing resources; that the public sector and the private sector must earn more; that the private sector should make profit, not on the basis of monopoly rights, not by shutting itself from competition, but by justifying its existence in the market place, by efficiency, by lowering costs, by improving quality. And that requires a deep commitment. If this becomes a subject-matter of dispute, there is a very real danger that this country may get, I think, mired in stagflation.

Look at the financial system of this country. The people who are employed in the financial system of the country are the best paid lot among the workers. We have said, I have said and the Prime Minister has said, that we will not retrench any single worker in the financial system, we will not do any such thing in the rest of the economy. And yet you have a spectacle today that, for political reasons, every three months a general strike is called in the banking system. Now, is this sort of behaviour this Parliament is going to commend? I can tell you, if India's financial system is going to be managed in this way, if cheque clearance in this country is going to take 23 days, then let us say good-bye to the hope of becoming a front-ranking nation in the world. I have no magic solutions if the people in this country want to perpetuate this sort of attitude, this sort of mind-set, when dealing with the nation's problems, if they would expect that loss-making units, regardless of their potential, must be subsidised year after year, I think I have no solution to see that you are not in stagna-

6.00P.M tion. Whether this country gets mired in stagnation or realises this tremendous unexpected potential depends upon the lead this House and the leadership of this country gives. If we collectively resolve that we will overcome these past drawbacks these past deficiencies, I have no reason to doubt that, India is on to better days. The world already senses it. It is for nothing that what happens in regard to its economic policies attracts the attention all over the world on the front pages. Is it not enough that the London Economist has

[Shri Manmohan Singh]

the first page devoted to what is happening in India?

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY: What did it say?

SHRI MANMOHAN SINGH: It never happened....

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA: It gives a character certificate.

SHRI MANMOHAN SINGH: The world is now recognising...

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA: He is drawing on the British Compliments. It is good.

SHRI MANMOHAN SINGH: The world now recognises that India is on the threshold of a new era. But whether we really convert it into a mighty race for accelerating growth, greater social justice, will depend upon the collective leadership emanating from this House and the other House. Let us collectively work to realise that great dream. With these words I would once again commend that the Budget be passed. (*Interruptions*)

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now the discussion is over.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY: Madam, I will not put too many questions. When the Finance Minister is willing to respond, will you kindly cooperate? If he does not want to respond, then I will not ask.

SHRI S. S. AHLUWALIA (Bihar): Seek the sense of the House.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY: The Finance Minister has conveniently avoided explaining the giving away of concessions in the area of customs duty. Secondly, he has refused to draw a distinction between what is known as the fiscal deficit and the revenue deficit. Revenue deficit is much higher this year than what it was in 1991. (*Interruptions*).

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order, Please. (*Interruptions* list one minute. Please take your seat. (*Interruptions*).

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY: I shall not press for an answer because I know they do not have an answer. (*Interruptions*).

श्री एस० एस० आहलुवालिया : मेरे पास भी बहुत सारे सवाल हैं। इसका इस तरह से कोई अन्त नहीं होगा, अगर लम्बे-लम्बे भाषण होंगे।...(व्यवधान)...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Ahluwalia, please sit down. It is not only for the Finance Minister to be agreeable to answer. I have also to look at the business before me. I cannot allow 10, 20, 30 hours more discussion on it. If Mr. Jaipal Reddy is withdrawing his question, fine. The discussion is over.

SHRI MENTAY PADMANABHAM: Madam, the Finance Minister is ready to react. He is prepared to reply... (*Interruptions*). Let the House have the benefit of his reaction. (*Interruptions*).

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: This is not the way. Please sit down. He may be prepared... (*Interruptions*). Mr Reddy, how can I allow you when I do not allow some other persons? I shall not have preferential treatment. .. (*Interruptions*)... I have to allow the ruling party Members and other Members here and there, everybody. I cannot allow this to go on up to 6 o'clock when I have got a lot of business here. ...(*Interruptions*)... We have not two Statutory Resolutions, the Special Court (Trial of Offences Relating to Transactions in Securities) Amendment Bill, 1994, a lot of things.

(*Interruptions*).

SHRI MENTAY PADMANABHAM: Madam, you bring order in this House.

उपसभापति : बैठ जाइये..(व्यवधान)

SHRI MENTAY PADMANABHAM: What is this? Mr. Ahluwalia cannot hold the House to ransom.

श्री एस० एस० आहलुवालिया : आप क्या कर रहे हैं ?

SHRI MENTAY PADMANABHAM: The hon. Members want to seek.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Don't get agitated. ...(Interruptions)...

वे बैठ गये हैं, आप बैठ जाइये ।

Mr. Ahluwalia has sat down.

SHRI MENTAY PADMANABHAM: He cannot fool all of us... (*Interruptions*)...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Ahluwalia is now sitting and not speaking... (*Interruptions*)... Keep quiet. ... (*Interruption*)... Now keep quiet.

SHRI MENTAY PADMANABHAM: Madam, we take serious objection to it. He has no power to direct us. ... (*Interruptions*)...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I cannot allow you, Mr. Virumbi... (*Interruptions*)... The discussion is over... (*Interruptions*)... We cannot another question Hour.

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA (West Bengal): Madam, there is a convention in this House. In the past, whether it was the Prime Minister or the hon. Finance Minister, whenever he concluded his speech, we were always given the privilege of asking a few questions. Of course, it is the freedom of the hon. Ministers to answer or not to answer, but this right of the Opposition cannot be taken away.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Okay. ...(*Interruptions*)... I am not aware of any such convention. I am sorry. ... (*Interruptions*)... I am sorry. Mr. Gurudas Das Gupta. For 1994 Budget if you want to have a new convention, we have to think about it... (*Interruptions*)... We don't have ...(*Interruptions*)... We had a long discussion. ...(*Interruptions*)... Mr. Jaipal Reddy, I cannot answer when ten people are speaking at a time. Please have courtesy. ...(*Interruptions*)...

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY: Madam, we are not interested in reply. We know what the reply will be. We are not asking any concessions from him.

...(*Interruptions*)...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now the matter is over.

...(*Interruptions*)...

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY: The House is not at the mercy of the Congress Members. We would like to make it clear. We are not in need of reply or enlightenment from the Finance Minister. If he is not replying, we shall not have any clarifications.. (*Interruptions*)...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I think I can bring the House to order. ... (*Interruptions*)... Please listen to me. The Finance Minister never refused to answer but the question is... (*Interruptions*)...

आप चुप हो जाएंगे.....

...(*Interruptions*)... Just a minute. Can you keep quiet, Mr. Reddy?

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY: I have withdrawn my questions. Madam, I have withdrawn my questions.

(*Interruptions*)

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I am sorry... (*Interruptions*)...

आप चुप हो जाइये ..

Mr. Jogi, please keep quiet. Please keep quiet. Mr. Jaipal Reddy, the question is, we had a debate for the longest period in this House. Everybody had put his questions. If you want, there can be one query or two queries but I cannot open another debate, that I can assure you.

SHRI MENTAY PADMANABHAM: Let him reply to two or three questions.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I did not aallow you Mr. Jaipal Reddy had put a question... (*Interruptions*)... I

[The Deputy Chairman]

am not allowing you, Mr. Jibon Roy. ...(*Interruptions*)... I have not allowed you. Please sit down.

SHRI MANMOHAN SINGH: Madam, I have great respect for my friend, Shri Jaipal Reddy, and I deem it an honour to respond to his question. Now, his first question is with regard to import duties. I think this House has to recognise that there is a lot of misconception in the public mind that when we lower the import duties we are helping the foreigners. If you look at what we have done in the import duty restructuring, you will find that the sharpest reductions have been made in areas of intermediate products, in raw materials and in those capital goods which are not produced in our country so as to strengthen the competitiveness of our country. I again repeat that this is not a concession to foreigners. These are concessions to Indian industries in the hope that the Indian industry will become more competitive and in due course under competitive pressure it will pass on these benefits to the Indian consumers. There is unfortunately a widespread mistaken belief in the country that whenever you are lowering the import duties you are helping the foreigners. No. We are helping our people. (*Interruptions*)...

Now, the second question by my esteemed friend is that I talked about the fiscal deficit and I did not talk about revenue deficit. I am worried about the fiscal deficit. But I am also worried about the revenue deficit. Now, what is revenue deficit? The revenue deficit in our country is not the revenue deficit that one normally talks about. Take the case of the whole expenditure on rural development. (*Interruptions*)... I am talking of development expenditure. Today, from the bulk of the Central assistance for State Plans, 70 per cent goes in the form of grants to special category States. Thirty per cent goes to other States. All that is shown as revenue expenditure. But it is helping the States to increase capital formation in the areas of their concern. Similarly, at the Central level if you look at the Central Plan the bulk of the Central Budget support is for areas like education, like health, like rural development. When we talk of rural development, if the Government of India were a company to invest in rural infrastructure, in roads, in afforestation, it would have been considered as capital expenditure. But because of the accounting convention—this is a State grant from the Budget—it is shown as revenue expenditure. I do agree that over a period of time our efforts should be to finance increasingly even these things out of the revenue. But I cannot do so simultaneously because there is a pressure to increase expenditure on anti-poverty programmes. There is an urgent need to step up expenditure on education, on health. Though I endorse the direction in which you would like us to move in the short term, there are limitations for the reasons that I mentioned. Now the third question is about excise duty. I am glad that this question is being asked. I should have clarified that thing right in the beginning. I have received a large number of representations, some of them stating that what you have done is hurting the small industry and the tiny industry. I would like to clarify on the floor of the House that we have done nothing to hurt the small industry or the tiny industry. In fact, the overall impact of the reduction in import duties is going to be beneficial, particularly to the small-scale industry. As far as the specific excise concessions which have been given are concerned, I want to repeat that we have not taken away any concession from small-scale industries which, according to the definition in the excise legislation, produces goods worth Rs. 30 lakhs or more. There is no increased burden in taxation. Between Rs. 35 lakhs and Rs. 75 lakhs there are concessional duties. That concessional duties still remain. If there is any particular problem..

SHRI VIREN J. SHAH: What about the inspectors?

SHRI MANMOHAN SINGH: As far as Inspectors are concerned, I think there are problems of harassment, corruption, etc. I do admit that. But we cannot solve the problems of corruption. To say that we should not bring our people in touch with the tax authorities is saying good-bye to progress. Our people have to accept that they must pay taxes voluntarily. At

the same time, I will make an honest effort to see that the scope for harassment on the part of the tax officials is minimised. That is why I have reduced tax rules. That is why I have eliminated the maze of unused exemptions. Nobody really knew what the tax liability was. It was all in a book which was kept on the table of an inspector. I want to eliminate all this. I want to bring transparency. I want to reduce the scope of litigation. The big people can maintain liaison houses in Delhi, but small people cannot do so. I honestly believe that the process which I have initiated will, in the long run, provide added strength to the small men. I am not saying that I am infallible. If there are any anomalies, if there are any mistakes which have crept in, I will apply my mind to them. Already, our officials are receiving everybody to listen to their grievances. I will personally satisfy myself that the system that we have evolved serves the ends of this country.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now, we have the Statutory Resolution and the Special Court Amendment Bill, 1994. We also have the Coffee (Amendment) Bill, 1994. If the House agrees, we can first take up the Coffee (Amendment) Bill.

SHRI VIREN J. SHAH: The Special Court Amendment Bill should be taken up first.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Actually, the Coffee (Amendment) Bill does not have too much of a controversy. We can finish it very fast.

SHRI VIREN J. SHAH: Madam, we can first finish the Special Court Amendment Bill.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Actually, many Members want to speak on this Bill. But, I think nobody is interested to speak on the Coffee Bill.

SHRI VIREN J. SHAH: Madam, the Special Court Amendment Bill is listed first. Let us take it first.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I have no objection. We have to finish all the business today and tomorrow. Tomorrow, there is the Private Member's business. Then the retiring Members will be given send-off in the morning. We have a party for the retiring Members. So, keeping that in view, it will be better if we finish all the business today. Now, we shall take up the Statutory Resolution and the Special Court Amendment Bill, 1994.

I. STATUTORY RESOLUTION SEEKING DISAPPROVAL OF SPECIAL COURT (TRIAL OF OFFENCES RELATING TO TRANSACTIONS SECURITIES) AMENDMENT ORDINANCE, 1994.

II. THE SPECIAL COURT (TRIAL OF OFFENCES RELATING TO TRANSACTIONS IN SECURITIES) AMENDMENT BILL, 1994...

SHRI VIREN J. SHAH: (Maharashtra) Madam, I move:

> That this House disapproves of the Special Court (Trial of Offences relating to Transactions in Securities) Amendment Ordinance, 1994 (No. 3 of 1994) promulgated by the President on the 25th January, 1994

Madam, as I have said on earlier occasions also, it has been the principle of the Government to promulgate an ordinance when it was not necessary at all. Why am I opposing it? Madam, we would support the Bill as we did in the Lok Sabha. In 1992, a full debate took place on this subject. The last Session ended on the 30th December, 1993. This Ordinance was issued on the 25th January, 1994. When this Session was to commence on the 21st February, 1994, what was the purpose of issuing this Ordinance? During the trial of this great scam, an objection was raised about the civil jurisdiction of the Special Court. The point is: why is it that our Ministry of Law or the other concerned Ministries are not able to anticipate what would be required particularly, when we are trying a major case like the Scam? Why was it not anticipated?